The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1921 NUMBER 325

Contents

The Week 353
Editorials
- The Allied Debts Again 356
- James Huneker 357
- Labor Control of Industry 358
- The Berger Decision 360

General Articles
- The Labor Spy, II ..... Sidney Howard 362
- Are We Out of Europe? .... Andrew Ten Eyck 364
- The Unemployment Crisis in England ..... R. H. Tawney 366
- On Reading My Diary (Verse) ..... Siegfried Sassoon 368
- Portrait of a Home Town ..... Constance Mayfield Rourke 369
- Austria, Hungary and the Habsburgs ..... Karl Renner 371
- Before the Curtain Rises .... Edward G. Lowry 373
- Unknown Joy (Verse) ..... Alice Corbin 375

Correspondence 375
Books and Things ..... P. L. 380
Reviews of Books
- The Aesthetic Attitude ..... F. H. 381
- A Chronicle of Facts ..... Carl Becker 382
- The Shadow ..... W. E. B. Du Bois 383
- The Golden Bird ..... H. S. G. 384

Selected Current Books 384

The Week

WHEN the Naval Affairs committee stated that to suspend for six months would disorganize the working forces, cause a deterioration of material, and a dislocation of contracts, it made its one contribution to the discussion. The committee estimates the cost of suspension at from fifteen to twenty-five million dollars. That is an item. It is a little less than the cost of one dreadnought. So the argument narrows down to this: if there is a six months holiday; if at the end of it no permanent reduction of armaments has been agreed to; if it is determined that the program adopted is still technically sound, then the experiment will have cost fifteen to twenty-five million dollars. But what if the holiday works? What if the naval Powers agree on a ratio and suspend all competition? What if careful study of the lessons of war determines that for defense less capital ships are desired? Why then the saving would be ever so much greater than the loss. Looked at simply in terms of money the question comes to this: is it worth while to risk something less than the cost of one dreadnought to find out whether we can stop building dreadnoughts, and whether as a matter of naval efficiency it is good sense to build so great a proportion of dreadnoughts?

THERE are thus two issues: one is whether we need the enormous navy contemplated by the General Board; the other is whether the General Board is building the right kind of navy. In regard to our needs it is not enough to discourse vaguely about the lessons of history. It is hardly a matter for the Naval Affairs Committee, and certainly none at all for the General Board. It is a matter for the President and the State Department primarily. Until they have found out from Britain and Japan whether an agreement is possible, no opinion about what we "need" is of the least value. Those who believe in reduction believe that Britain and Japan would jump at the chance for an understanding. If they are wrong then all talk about disarmament is useless. But until they are shown to be wrong the burden of proof is on their opponents. And so long as we push the pace in armament the suspicion that we have aggressive intentions cannot be dispelled. In regard to the technical question of the capital ship there is room for honest difference. But even here there enters a factor that is diplomatic rather than technical. It is whether the navy we are building is designed to defend our shores and our essential trade routes, or whether it is designed for attack in any part of the world. The war showed clearly enough that there is a difference between a defensive and an offensive navy.

THOSE who are opposed to reduction have revealed where they will make their last ditch fight. When public opinion has reached the point where it can no longer be restricted, the old trick of making the best the enemy of the better will be turned. In order to forestall a practical naval agreement with Britain and Japan for reduction,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the cry will go up for a general conference for universal disarmament on land and sea. That would wreck the whole movement. For the military question in constitutional Europe is too hopelessly complex to be brought into the naval question. The general conference should follow, under no circumstances should it precede, the specific agreement with Britain and Japan. Those who want to accomplish a practicable advance will look with the deepest suspicion on the big phrases about a "general" conference, dealing with something "universal," and talking about "dis"-armament. They will ask for a specific agreement between Tokio, London, and Washington for a specific reduction. That alone is immediately possible, and anything more would make even that impossible.

AN honest bewilderment appears in this statement of Senator Harding's to a correspondent of the New York American: "I will do everything that is becoming to bring about the cooperation of the United States in any scheme for world disarmament." Doesn't this mean: "I may do everything, or I may do nothing, but whatever I do, it will be becoming." There is something very simple and genuine about Senator Harding that tells us that where another might appear to be stalling, he is trying very hard to find the best thing to do. He would like to do right, he would like to please everybody. Babel is boxing the compass, and Senator Harding, with his honest perplexed hand on the wheel, would like to steer to all points simultaneously. But which is it to be? North, or Southwest by West, or North-North-East or East . . . ? The only solution would be some immense circular Ship of State, moving, expanding ex-centrically in all directions at once. It looks as if our craft's course for the next four years would lie Yes-Yes by No.

A DISPATCH to the Boston Evening Transcript from Mr. William E. Brigham, its Washington correspondent, makes it possible to foretell with a very fair chance of being right what will be the Mexican policy of the Harding administration. For Mr. Brigham enjoys the confidence of Senator Lodge, who is in agreement with Senator Fall. And it is Senator Fall, even from his post at the Interior, who will be mainly responsible for Mexican policy. The first act of that policy must be to fix the terms upon which the government of Mexico is to be recognized. These terms are already formulated. Senator Fall will propose that Mexico and the United States agree on commissions to settle boundary disputes and property damage claims; that Mexico shall not apply Article 27 of its constitution to deprive Americans of hitherto legally acquired property rights; that agreements shall be made for the protection of American citizens and their property rights in Mexico; and that these various agreements shall be written down in the form of a protocol.

THIS last point is the most delicate one. Here is the choice: Shall the Mexican government, which to judge from the words of President Obregon is willing to make considerable concessions, be allowed to make these concessions in substance alone? Or shall it also be summoned to express the form of these concessions in official words of humiliating clarity? Not satisfied with dollars and property rights, will the United States also demand verbal submission? We are informed that the British oil companies have arrived at a mutually satisfactory agreement with the Mexicans, and since they secured all the substance they wanted, have not demanded the form. But the British government is more likely to follow the lead of our government than that of British oil companies. So it is up to our oil companies to follow the example of the British companies and not require Mexico to submit to us. The final calculation will depend on a practical judgment: How far does the Harding administration wish to support the Obregon regime? How much humiliation can that regime endure and survive?

MANY people must still wonder, on his birthday, what Washington was like. Time has handed down to us a picture of him so blurred that he seems hardly more alive than the frigid, benevolent, firm, chaste man on the two-cent stamp, or the Stuart portrait with its sphinx-like wig; or the vague Washington of the Delaware, Valley Forge, the cherry tree and the lie that could not be told. Reverence and a sort of mythology have conspired to make of Washington an inscrutable, vaguely haloed figure. Yet to men of the Revolution Washington was far from unreal. If a certain unshakable stolidity, a self-sufficing dignity made them feel something almost like awe in his presence, it was not because he struck them as remote but because, mentally and physically, he was the largest figure of those times. Others were more brilliant, more acute, more expressive, but Washington put them in the shade by his almost more than human allowance of courage, shrewdness, power and unselfconscious energy. We ought to be able to take our eyes off the solitary profile on the two-cent stamp long enough to remember that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great as Washington was, he did not know how to amuse himself when he was alone. And this testimony of Josiah Quincy, written in 1808, helps to make him seem still realler to us: "he could throw a stone farther than any man in Virginia."

BIT by bit the evidence on which Thomas Mooney was convicted has crumbled away. Within the last few months James Brennan, who acted as Assistant District Attorney, and Draper Hand, a policeman who made some arrests in the case, have made statements acknowledging that there were irregularities. Now one of the chief witnesses, an ex-circus performer and floater named MacDonald, has confessed that he saw a man leave a suitcase at the crossing where the Preparedness Day explosion occurred, and that he was wheedled and browbeaten by the District Attorney, Fickert, into swearing at the trial that he was positively able to identify this man as Mooney. As a matter of fact, says MacDonald now, he did not notice the stranger particularly and was not even sure whether he was white or colored. MacDonald was told that he would receive a slice of the reward of $17,500 offered for the conviction of the dynamiters. Who can doubt any longer that Mooney was "framed-up"? It seems almost certain that Mooney will be pardoned by the governor of California. But what justice is there in pardoning a man for a crime he never committed? Only a thorough investigation to discover who induced the witnesses to commit perjury, and why, will satisfy justice.

THESE times have taught us to expect that at regular intervals some not very important person should startle heaven with violent and meaningless thunder. The other day the chairman of an Americanism committee, a Mr. Henry J. Ryan, declared that 8,000 teachers, a quarter of them college professors, were "disloyal." Has he taken a census of these 8,000, and applied to each one of them individually his yardstick of loyalty? Is he prepared to give their names? Almost certainly not. Then what is Mr. Ryan trying to do? Apparently he wants to scare people into helping raise the salaries of teachers by parading the ghost of sedition. "The agitators," he says, "are using the low salaries of teachers as bait in the spreading of their propaganda." The best reason, according to him, for giving teachers the raise they desperately need, is that they will turn Bolshevik if they don't get it. Did it ever occur to him that much as the teachers need and deserve a raise in salary, they are self-respecting human beings whom it is not desirable to insult?

THE French Chamber of Deputies voted confidence in Premier Briand by 387 votes to 125. Some 50 to 60 members did not vote. This is not an expression of one hundred per cent confidence. Evidently many of the deputies still feel that Germany has not been dealt with strictly enough. It was this feeling that forced Leygues out. And M. Briand evidently had this feeling in mind when he said to the Chamber: "If tomorrow the hour of penalties strikes I shall go with the Allies to the last step. But if I must go alone I shall not go. I shall not go except with our Allies." M. Briand openly challenges those who think that not enough has been asked of Germany, and who value the exaction of extreme demands from Germany, both as to disarmament and reparations, above the friendship of an England that has more reasonable expectations. The vote showed the disappointed to be still threateningly numerous. But it would not have been surprising had M. Briand won by a less satisfactory majority. Perhaps the vote marked a step in the deflation of French hopes that is very likely taking place.

THE Union of South Africa has voted to remain a member of the British Empire. This is what the victory of General Smuts's African party means. It is a conclusive victory. In the last parliament, the South African party, with 41 seats, did not even have a plurality—for the secession party of the Nationalists had 44—and General Smuts's government managed to remain in power only because the Unionist and Labor parties, with about twenty seats each, did not care to turn it out. But now the Dutch South African party, strengthened by the amalgamation of the almost solidly English Unionists, has won nearly 80 seats on a platform of staying within the Empire, and the secessionists have won only half as many. If these Nationalists, almost all of them Dutch, wish to leave the Empire, the election proves that fully as many Dutchmen more have not forgotten the recent treatment by England under Campbell-Bannerman, and realize the advantages of a continued alliance. General Smuts's victory is a triumph for the liberal policy of England, and proves liberty to be a philosopher's stone that will turn enemies into friends.

IN Peter Kropotkin the Russian Revolution has lost one of its grandest and most human figures. In Russia his singularly complete personality dwarfed most of the others around him. His explorations and contributions to his country's geography, before the revolution claimed his whole

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

energy, were on the way to make his one of the biggest names in the science. Once heart and soul in the fight against autocracy, he managed to keep toward the Tsar and other enemies a detached, almost sympathetic point of view. His entire lack of bitterness, even after cruel imprisonments, did not lessen the determination with which he fought. He trusted men in general, and believed in them; believed profoundly that men everywhere were better than the institutions they had built about them. A society governed by the natural goodness and decency of men when released from the chains of government was his goal. Force, centralization, were utterly alien to him. What were his feelings when the November revolution, the final revolution, turned out to be something violent, uncompromising, strident, ungrateful? He shared the tragedy of other old revolutionists of the seventies who saw the crop they had sown reaped by others. But whatever he may have felt, it was not bitterness. He never joined the ranks of those who were eager to have foreign armies settle Russia's affairs.

The Allied Debts Again

IT would have been perfectly natural and proper for the Allied governments, formally or informally, to sound out the American government's views on the subject of the cancellation of war debts due to the United States. It would have been perfectly natural and proper for the United States government to give serious consideration to this proposal. The problem of transcendent importance, for the United States as for the rest of the world, is the restoration of the economic life of Europe. Until substantial progress has been made toward the solution of this problem, and the nations of Europe have turned their attention and energies to the arts of peace, there can be no solid basis in international harmony for any movement for the elimination of the risks of war and the curtailment of the wastes of preparation for war. The Allied debts to America do unquestionably represent a heavy incubus upon European economic recovery. Nothing is being paid on them, to be sure, neither interest nor principal, but that means that they are accumulating, to fall upon the Allied exchequers as soon as they approach solvency. And that is one of the forces that drive the Allied governments to such counsels of desperation as the recent indemnity agreement. That agreement, it must be admitted, can be effective even nominally only on condition that the Allied Powers hold themselves in constant readiness to apply armed force. We may talk as much as we please about disarmament, but France will not reduce her army, nor England her navy, so long as they may be required at any time to invade Germany by land and blockade her by sea in order to execute their indemnity policies.

It is a shortsighted view, then, that makes mere financial items out of the Allied debts to America. They are an essential part of the complex of forces that are pressing Europe toward new disorders and wars—wars which may, for all we know, involve the United States directly. America cannot afford to assume the attitude that the question of the remission of those debts is beyond discussion.

No more, however, can she afford to assume the attitude of a benevolent aunt and wipe the debts out without further conditions. That would have been a reasonable policy if the Allied nations, like the United States, had refrained from grasping at the spoils of war. Then it could have been argued cogently that the war was a purely collective enterprise, and its costs, from the beginning, rightfully a common charge. But since there was no spirit of community in the settlement, that argument falls to the ground. The United States may properly be expected to concern itself about Allied financial embarrassments only in so far as they affect its own interest in the future peace of the world. What have the Allied governments to offer us, in the way of guarantees of peace, that would be a fair offset for our claims upon them of ten billion dollars?

England, it appears, might be willing to cancel the obligations she holds against the other Allied nations if we cancelled England's debt to us. For a preliminary offer, that is not intolerable. England would assume a position in this respect much less favorable than France. For England would lose about as much as she would gain by the transaction, since what she owes the United States is no more than is due her from the other Allies, while France would benefit from both the British and the American cancellations. But the preliminary offer is nevertheless not good enough for the United States to accept. England cannot expect the United States to enter into a transaction which involves the loss of ten billions to the United States and lets England out whole. It is true enough that the United States has a stake in European recovery worth more than ten billions, but England has a still greater stake in it. England will have to offer more than a plan for cancelling debts all around.

One thing she might reasonably be expected to offer is the relinquishment of the greater part of her claim to indemnity, in favor of France. There never has been the least doubt that of the "damage

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

done to the civilian population of the Allies and to their property by the aggression of Germany by land, by sea and from the air," the only damage for which compensation was stipulated in the armistice agreement, a much greater proportion was suffered by France than the fifty-one per cent assumed in the current arrangements for dividing the indemnity payments. It is true that France helped to trick herself into this inequitable distribution when she voted to include pensions and separation allowances in the category of "damages to the civilian population of the Allies and to their property." But if the French did not know what they were doing when they consented thus to water away their claims, the British knew exactly what they were doing and how they would profit by it. This initial wrong done to France can hardly stand uncorrected if America is to consider as in perfect good faith any British proposals for debt cancellations.

But the United States and England could not entertain proposals for improving the position of France unless France herself exhibited a willingness to work toward a peace of reconciliation. The first condition would be a reconsideration of the indemnity and its restoration to the footing of reparations proper, as contemplated in the armistice agreement. On that footing France, being entitled to perhaps three-fourths of the whole, would probably secure enough to repair the devastated areas if economically spent, but not otherwise. Such an indemnity could be put in the form of a capital sum, bearing whatever rate of interest might be necessary to float it at par in the markets of the world. That it could be made to float at par, and so furnish current funds for reparation, is not to be doubted, if Germany were permitted to rehabilitate her industry and find her own devices for liquidating the interest and capital, and were relieved of the burden of armies of occupation, as she might well be, if the reparation bonds had once become liquid and distributed among investors all over the world.

The obligation would remain upon Germany to refrain from reconstituting an offensive army and navy. That obligation would not be so difficult to enforce, if an avenue to economic recovery were opened to German activity and the perennial menace of an invasion of the Ruhr were removed. Accordingly, with the international economic and financial problems on the way to a satisfactory solution, it would fall within the range of practical politics to arrange for reduction of armaments, not alone on sea, where only the three friendly Powers, the United States, England and Japan are seriously involved, but on land as well, where France, Italy, Jugoslavia, Czecho-Slovakia, Rumania and Poland all carry excessively burdensome armaments, in the fear that another great storm of militarism may blow up out of the existing chaos.

The United States could afford to cancel the Allied debts. But only on condition that the Allies and the United States were ready to cooperate in binding up the wounds of the late war and in working in good faith to combat the forces that are making for more wars in the future.

James Huneker

JAMES HUNEKER named one of his best books The Pathos of Distance. In a single day his own figure is invested with the memorial gentleness there inscribed. His end has caught us taking him for granted, as we take most good things for granted. It plunges us into consciousness of his racy and generous temperament, his brio, his vividness, his clairvoyance. If he had held himself more seriously as a pundit, perhaps his general ideas might first be brought to attention, but, as he said of Egoists and Iconoclasts, those books omitted something he did not believe in, "the famous 'general ideas'." Iconoclasts, he said, "contained no preface which might have helped the reader across arid and thorny definitions; no friendly footnotes; not even a postlude instead of a preface, in which would be found a neat little theory of a school or a 'stream of tendencies'; no special application of the art of plumbing to doctrines held by various dramatists." What remain, consequently, are his "madmen, wits, saints and sinners," his gallery of personalities and his capture of their grandeur and glory and humor—these in a series of volumes for which he had a perceptive American publisher from the first.

It is no part of the standing quarrel between the field forces of criticism and its general staff to say that Huneker was naturally enlisted in active service. This was due in some measure to the exigencies of place and time. His America could not possibly accommodate within its narrow working ideas the multifold artistic Europe of which he had such fresh and special tidings. He was condemned to devote himself to the more immediate forms of interpretation. To such interpretation he gave himself without reserve or stint. It was necessarily a journalistic task, undertaken with unselfishness, and it was over-lighted with new names and references. The effect on such shaded eyes as Max Beerbohm's, for example, was to make Huneker seem exuberantly young. He was young, especially in unaffected response and energy. He needed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

youth to bring home his word to England and Ireland, Germany and France.

But he worked with good heart and true intuition. Not following in others' footsteps, as is the common fault of the authoritarians, he has proved to be the forerunner of the age that is now flourishing, with the heroes of this age the men whom he discerned and proclaimed on his own responsibility, in a manner which was equally spirited. Ibsen, Tolstoy, Wagner, Nietzsche, Meredith, Henry James, William James, Bergson, Anatole France, Lemaître, Faguet, Shaw, Wilde, George Moore, Yeats, Synge, Schnitzler, Rodin, Matisse, Gauguin, Picasso, Van Gogh, the American painters— the subjects of his adventurous revelations are innumerable. The only thing he refused to discover was socialism and man's humanity to man. He kept his eye on old Adam, and on Eve and the apple; and he judged literature and the arts without sociological intent.

If only for this reason, James Huneker should not be regarded from the ordinary purposive point of view. He was a Dionysiac force in criticism, gay and warm as well as sharp and spiced and stinging. His relish for life and literature, his torrent of allusion and enumeration, should keep him from the pigeon-hole of classification. He was a creator who loved every variety of artistic creativeness, and gave this country an unexempled report of it. To lose him is to lose a true watcher of the skies.

Labor Control of Industry

IT is difficult nowadays, to throw practical, hard-headed American business men into a state of excitement over platforms, pronouncements of principles, idealistic preambles to documents otherwise commonplace. So many counterfeit words have been in circulation ever since we set out to "make the world safe for democracy" that the whole currency is sadly depreciated. But the gentlemen who are trying to destroy the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and to restore the good old days of the Song of the Shirt and noisome sweatshops have managed to arouse considerable trepidation over the dynamic possibilities of the words of a trade union preamble. "Rank sovietism," cries the Times, in apparently unfeigned horror. The ideals of the clothing workers differ from the Bolshevist program "only in being more intelligent, practical—and cautious." The Amalgamated, as the Times admits, has a record of "achievement almost without a parallel in the history of American labor." "During many decades of a struggle that in many aspects has been heroic, they have raised the industry out of the sweatshop into conditions that are appreciably sanitary, humane and prosperous." Nevertheless the disruption of the Amalgamated "would be a clear gain if it resulted in a new organization that conceives Americanism in terms of free and wholesome living, of reasonable give and take—not in terms of Bolshevist propaganda."

What are those horrific ideals of the Amalgamated, that leader writers and business men who lay claim to even the least interest in the public welfare should wish to choke them out by plunging the industry again into the mire of the sweatshop in the forlorn hope that presently the industry might emerge clean and Americanized? It may be worth noting, in the first place, that those ideals were not dictated by Moscow. The offending preamble was adopted in 1914, when Moscow was safe in the arms of the Tsar and the secret police. It is also worth noting that the preamble is not so much an expression of ideals as a theory of economic conditions as they now exist and as they will exist at some point in the indefinite future. That theory, in a nutshell, is that capital now controls industry, and therefore "rules," but that in the course of evolution labor will come into control of industry and establish its own rule.

Let us examine the argument of this preamble in detail. Under present conditions "the class owning [the means of production] is the one that is ruling; the class that possesses nothing but its labor power . . . . is the one that is being ruled." Shall we quarrel with this formula? Not long ago that most distinguished apostle of capitalism, Chancellor Day, declared that it is the capitalist who fills the workingman's dinner pail. Now the power to fill the dinner pail or leave it empty is not equivalent to rule—in the eyes of those who do not eat. But it looks like rule to the simple workingman. "Modern industrial conditions are very rapidly wiping out the old craft demarcations, and the resultant conditions dictate the organization of labor along industrial lines." That may be too general a statement, but on the whole, is it not about as true as any accepted economic formula? "The same forces that have been making for industrial unionism are likewise making for a close industrial alliance of the working class." Possibly, perhaps even probably, but the impartial outsider will keep his mind open for the evidence. "This inevitable process will eventually lead to a universal working class organization." Perhaps. "For the consummation of this great end the education of the working class is most essential." Yes indeed, and it is a brave spirit that expects this condition to be adequately met in the near future.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So far we have encountered nothing specifically subversive or revolutionary. But now we come to the final paragraph, which is worth quoting in full, as the real source of all the terrors of the Times and the employers.

"The industrial and inter-industrial organization built upon the solid rock of clear knowledge and class consciousness will put the organized working class in actual control of the system of production, and the working class will then be ready to take possession of it."

But even this is theoretical speculation, rather than a program of action. It assumes that forces now at work in industry, not forces of propaganda and political manoeuvring, but the evolution of the productive processes under capitalistic management, will draw labor together in industrial and inter-industrial organizations. Such organizations, it is admitted, would not work unless labor gains a competent knowledge of industry as a whole. Therefore, it is proposed to disseminate such knowledge through education. With these two conditions fulfilled, labor, commanding both the man power of industry and the technical knowledge necessary for operating industry, would be in a position to assume control and "ownership" of industry. We are not told what would become of capital, whether it would be confiscated or merely reduced to the rank of a "commodity," to be hired and controlled as labor is now hired and controlled. But since the new order is to be based on "the solid rock of clear knowledge," capital would probably be accorded the minimum necessary for subsistence, as labor is now accorded its minimum.

In the present stage of economic evolution the capitalist employer is the dominant figure in industry. The Amalgamated preamble advances the theory that in the next stage the laborer, organized and broadly trained, will be the dominant figure. Theories of evolution may be plausible or absurd, sound or harebrained, but they can appear seditious or subversive only in the eyes of those who refuse to recognize that the existing industrial system is itself a product of economic evolution, a comparatively recent product, and that there are no signs that the final term of evolution has been reached. In the course of not more than twelve generations western civilization has seen industrial control pass from the master craftsman to commercial capital, then to industrial capital, where it now rests, subject to the increasing intervention of financial capital. The master craftsman controlled industry by virtue of his command of technical processes; the merchant, by his command of the market; the industrial capitalist, by his command of workshop and tools and materials; the financier, by his command of credit. Who will be so bold as to assert the impossibility of another stage in which organized labor will assume a control of industry based upon control of the working personnel?

It is evident that there are difficult conditions to be fulfilled before such a control of industry would be practicable. In the first place labor would have to develop a body of experts competent not only to supervise the entire technical process but to handle the commercial processes of securing supplies and marketing products. It would have to educate the rank and file up to the point where differences in rewards gauged according to quality of service would be accepted in good faith. It would have to overcome the disposition of the individual worker to let the next man draw more than his share of the common load. A new technique of management and a new industrial spirit would be required.

But in our reflections upon the difficulties to be overcome before labor control of industry can be realized, we ought not to forget that the present system of capitalistic control encounters difficulties of its own, difficulties that would seem insuperable if we had not seen them overcome, in one way or another. Imagine that it was prophesied, now for the first time, that a system would prevail in which it was to the advantage of each industry to produce little and sell at high prices; in which it was to the advantage of each person engaged to find the minimum of performance compatible with continued employment; in which each group of workers pursued its own interests without regard to those of other groups; in which each group of property interests sought to freeze out other groups. Would not the Times thunder its bulls against such a comet as that?

Those ot us who do not feel ourselves vested with papal responsibility for the course of evolution will look forward with equanimity to the next stage in industrial development, whether it is to be one of labor control or not. Man has managed to live under capitalism; he will manage to live under whatever comes next. Capitalism came upon the world by imperceptible degrees, encountering resistance at some points but usually prevailing without a struggle because of its superiority in point of productiveness. If it is to be succeeded by another system, that system will probably also come on by degrees, sometimes with struggle, but usually prevailing by superior serviceability. It may be that the current demand of labor for an increasing share in control is an initial step toward the new order. That demand can justify itself on grounds of productive efficiency, as each successive demand of labor will have to do if it is to be realized.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Berger Decision

A GENTLE and generous philosopher noted the other day a growing "intuition" on the part of the masses that all judges, in lively controversies, are "more or less prejudiced." But between that "more or less" lies the whole kingdom of the mind; the differences between the "more or less" are the triumphs of disinterestedness, they are the aspirations we call justice. And the very consciousness by judges of potential prejudice, an alertness against its dominance, is in itself a potent corrective against the sway of prejudice. The basic consideration in the vitality of any system of law is confidence in this proximate purity of its process. Corruption from venality is hardly more damaging than a widespread belief of corrosion through partisanship.

Our judicial system is absolutely dependent upon a popular belief that it is as untainted in its workings as the finite limitations of disciplined human minds and feelings make possible. It is inevitable that (in the disposition of industrial and social controversies that come before them) our judges be limited by their own experience and environment and imagination. Against that the only safeguards are a healthy scepticism about their own beliefs, and a vigorous, informed and continuous critique from without of the judicial process. But there can be no justification for the cruder emotional and class prejudices; far better frankly enthrone force than use the forms of law as the instruments of lawlessness. Whoever shares in such preversion of "justice," or connives in its exercise, truly undermines the basis of the existing order. Consciousness of the gravity of this issue leads the New York Tribune to say: "The case of Mooney is important because it involves the honor of our judicial system. Never must there be given even plausibility to the radical charge that our courts are respecters of persons and amenable to improper influences."

This was the real issue of the Berger case before the Supreme Court. The decision did not call for a determination of Berger's guilt or innocence, his liability under the drag-net scope of the Espionage acts. The issue was the more fundamental one, whether Berger was tried according to law or by the lynch-law of war passions. Whatever be the contributing causes—the subsidence of fearsome feelings, the growing demonstration of lawless tyrannies and constitutional infractions all in the name of "law" and "patriotism," the growing articulation of the old faith in freedom—the Supreme Court in the Berger case has spoken with clarion clearness. As a result the atmosphere of the country seems less stifling and law bears less the mien of hypocrisy.

Professional comment has been inclined to whittle the decision down to a "technical" point of statutory construction, just as loose "radical" opinion has narrowed the decision to a personal significance. The New Republic believes that all decisions, particularly those of the United States Supreme Court, involving public issues must be quickened into widespread public understanding, and not be allowed to be buried in their technical ceremements. To be sure, a technical point of procedure, in the jargon of the lawyers, *was* the issue in the Berger case. But behind that technical point and behind Section 21 of the Federal Judicial Code lie issues that concern every citizen of a democracy.

Section 21 of the Judicial Code provides that

> Whenever a party to any action.....shall make..... an affidavit that the judge before whom the action..... is to be tried..... has a personal bias or prejudice .....against him.....such judge shall proceed no further therein, but another judge shall be designated.....Every such affidavit shall state the facts and the reasons for the belief that such bias or prejudice exists..... No party shall be entitled in any case to file more than one such affidavit; and no such affidavit shall be filed unless accompanied by a certificate of counsel of record that such affidavit and application are made in good faith.

Congressman Berger having been indicted, in effect, for obstructing the prosecution of our war against Germany, invoked Section 21 against Judge Landis, who was to preside at his trial. Berger set forth alleged utterances by Judge Landis, intemperate and unrestrained, showing virulent hatred of Germans ("if anybody has said anything worse about the Germans than I have, I would like to know it so I can use it") and of German-Americans ("one must have a very judicial mind indeed not to be prejudiced against the German-Americans in this country. Their hearts are reeking with disloyalty" etc.). On the basis of these utterances, Berger charged Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis with prejudice unfitting him for a fair trial of the case. The affidavit was accompanied by certificate of counsel vouching for its good faith.

Judge Landis denied his disqualification, denied the motion for the assignment of another judge, and the case proceeded to conviction, resulting in sentences of twenty years imprisonment to Berger and his associates. An appeal was thereupon taken to the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Seventh Circuit, but that Court, being in doubt upon the question which went to the very heart of the con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

viction, namely, whether in view of the affidavit against him Judge Landis was legally authorized to conduct the trial, certified this question to the Supreme Court.

The legal question as formulated by the Supreme Court was whether under Section 21 the filing of an affidavit of prejudice against a judge "compels his retirement from the case or whether he can exercise a judgment upon the facts affirmed and determine his qualification against them and the belief based upon them." In other words, where the facts and reasons in support of a claim of prejudice "are not frivolous or fanciful but substantial and formidable" may a judge charged with prejudice himself determine the truth or tenacity of his prejudices, or does such a charge automatically operate to make it his duty "to proceed no further" in the case?

The Supreme Court decisively answered the question put to it, (and has thereby established the practice of the Federal Courts,) by holding that an affidavit of prejudice, substantial in its allegations and duly supported by counsel's certificate of good faith, automatically disqualifies a judge whose fairness is thus impugned from presiding at a trial.

Here, as elsewhere, it is important to cut below the cuticle of the Court's opinion to reach the living tissues. On the surface the decision merely involves a detached effort to ascertain the meaning of Congressional expression and enforce it. But this objective—the interpretation of the will of Congress—is not the same thing as merely interpreting the English of Congress. Something more is involved than the distillation of the meanings of words. A choice from among different meanings attaching to the same collocation of words depends necessarily upon a choice of contesting considerations of policy. And Mr. Justice McKenna's forthright opinion reveals the ground of policy. In answering the alarms of dreadful consequences that the Court's decision will entail, Mr. Justice McKenna lets the cat of "policy" out of the bag of "law" by adding "but, we may say, that its [Congress's] solicitude is that the tribunals of the country shall not only be impartial in the controversies submitted to them, but shall give assurance that they are impartial." Or as Lord Chancellor Herschell long ago put it, "important as it is that people should get justice, it is even more important that they should be made to feel and see that they are getting it."

The dissenting Justices would admit this policy —as a general proposition. How comes it then that Justices Day and Pitney reach a different result in its application? Why do they allow the challenged judge to pass upon the truth of the prejudice charged against him? They do so, for one thing, because they are more impressed with the need of protecting Federal Judges against "imposition" than with the social importance of assuring impartiality: popular confidence in the fairness of our courts is not as urgent a policy to them as the rather remote danger, through an abuse of Section 21, "to the independent discharge of duties by federal judges." The second reason for the difference in the interpretations placed upon Section 21 by Mr. Justice McKenna and Mr. Justice Day is a difference in valuation of the psychologic factor in the judicial process. Justices Day and Pitney assume objectivity of judgment by judges, unswerved by unconscious emotional undertows. Mr. Justice McKenna, and this time, fortunately, the majority of the Court, are in a real sense humanists:

> To commit to the judge a decision upon the truth of the facts gives chance for the evil against which the Section is directed. The remedy by appeal is inadequate. It comes after the trial and if prejudice exist, it has worked its evil, and a judgment of it in a reviewing tribunal is precarious. It goes there fortified by presumptions, and nothing can be more elusive of estimate or decision than a disposition of a mind in which there is a personal ingredient.

Even the minority opinion of Justices Day and Pitney twice admits that the offending language of Judge Landis "might have been more temperate." Not so Mr. Justice McReynolds! To him Judge Landis was the normal patriot, and one who did not share the bilious hatred of Kenesaw Mountain "was simply unfit for his place." We leave Mr. Justice McReynolds to his pitiable isolation and to the judgment of his associates.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1921, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY ALVIN JOHNSON
FRANCIS HACKETT WALTER LIPPMANN
PHILIP LITTELL

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS, CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Labor Spy

II.
Industrial Harmony

THE industrial detective has solicited his business in his own words. Since he speaks with such conviction on matters which men are less anxious than they might be to believe, it seems worth while that he should display his own wares.

In the injunction suit brought against the Butler Agency of Philadelphia by the Sherman Service Inc., Mr. Sherman, in the Bill in Equity, described his business very eloquently as:

> . . . . establishing and maintaining peace and harmony, good will and efficiency in manufacturing, industrial and business enterprises among the employees and between the employees and employers thereof, throughout said territory, the resultant effect contributing to the stability of our national structure and greater mutual productivity to employer, employees and community . . .

and, said Mr. Sherman on the witness stand:

> We send representatives into a plant for the purpose of investigating and in order that they may report the real existing conditions in the plant. We term that *"invisible service"* because we believe we can develop the unbiassed and unprejudiced facts more clearly by invisible service. We receive daily reports from these individuals. We submit to our clients the substance or pith of these reports together with such recommendations as we believe essential . . ."

In 1917 the organization then bearing Mr. Sherman's name published a book which they withdrew almost immediately.

> The employees of a manufacturing house of national prominence submitted demands for a ten per cent increase. The company offered a five per cent advance, but, after several conferences without avail, over twelve hundred went out on strike.
>
> There had been no union among that particular trade, and, inasmuch as over two hundred thousand are employed in the trade throughout the United States, a certain union made a very concerted effort toward having the strikers organize . . . The company, on the other hand, being one of about fifty others controlled by one corporation, was equally persistent in preventing the above mentioned union from being successful . . .
>
> . . . We were called in and given carte blanche . . . Six secret operatives, two of each nationality most prevalent among the strikers, were detailed to learn the inside conditions, the acts and contemplations of the strikers and their leaders, who the most violent agitators were, the moral and financial support of the strikers and their organization, and, primarily, to gain positions of confidence and influence among the men so as to be able to render an effective service at the psychological time.
>
> After about two weeks . . . the mill reopened. Invitation was given to all former workers to return under the terms offered by the client.
>
> Almost simultaneously we detailed several of our recruiting agents to hire men suitable for permanent employment. We were permitted to offer whatever salary we deemed advisable . . . Also we were to furnish them with bed and board during the strike . . .
>
> These workers were not delivered to the plant until the second day after the mills had reopened, so that the importation did not affect those of the strikers who desired to go into work of their own accord. As no more than a dozen went in, fifty workers were delivered on the second day. Accompanying these workers were ten able bodied guards of commanding appearance . . . The appearance of the workers and the manner in which they were protected amazed the strikers . . . .
>
> For the next few days there was no apparent change in the situation. The strike leaders were very active; they maintained a severe picket line, enthusiastic speeches were made . . . .
>
> In the meantime we continued to import help . . . in groups of from fifty to seventy-five a day. Although we were very discriminating in our selection of workers whom we recruited, we found it expedient to detail four secret service operatives, hired in the same way as the other workers, to live in the different barracks and check any agitation which might arise among the recruits and to immediately report on any labor agitator or strike sympathizer who might have been hired accidentally. Through this service we were able to keep the factory one hundred per cent clean with loyal workers.
>
> The operatives originally detailed to cultivate the strikers had, in the meantime, gained positions of influence, two having become officers in the local union which had been started.* About eight additional secret service operatives were then detailed to augment the work of the others, and, after the plant had been opened about two weeks, we made a concerted effort to induce the strikers to return to work . . . In a very careful way our operatives caused the shop-keepers who catered to the strikers to realize that it was unprofitable for them to have the strike continue, and that it would be wisdom on their part to encourage the strikers who were their customers to return to work.
>
> The results . . . were soon forth-coming. Several of the strikers returned. The union leaders, however, became more active . . .
>
> Through our secret operatives, and particularly those who had gained influential positions in the local organization, we were able to anticipate every move of the strikers and leaders and by this means . . . were able to have several arrests made which resulted in proper convictions.

---

* This practice is not confined to any one agency. "It was the policy . . . . to place men called 'Company Operatives' in different branches of work in the different shops and charge the employers so much for each operative. Each operative was given an expense account and it was his duty to make friends with everybody, especially the agents and men high up in the organizations and the men who held positions in the locals. The Company offered me a bonus of fifty dollars to get a secretary's job in one of the locals in order to get the names and addresses of the men . . ."—Affidavit of Eckhardt Gieser, one time operative of the Corporations Auxiliary Co.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This inspired confidence in many more strikers and they returned . . . We engaged luxurious seven-passenger automobiles to convey them in groups between their residences and the factory. With each group we detailed a guard. This extraordinary form of transportation and the excellent protection afforded, served as a temptation for many strikers to return . . .

The company had no further need of conference with the labor leaders and at our advice denied interviews to any and all labor organization officials.

After eight weeks . . . the strike was declared off. All hands went back in a body on the following day . . .

The weekly meetings of the local union discontinued. The leaders of the strike were gradually discharged for one reason or another . . . Our operatives, surrounding themselves with many of the former strikers, upon meeting days, and going away upon recreation trips with them, the attendance at the meetings gradually diminished. At these a sufficient number of operatives were detailed to use the proper influence to promote legislation favorable to our client.

. . . . Then it was comparatively easy to start dissension among the leaders which increased to the extent that each gathering resulted in a fight. These occasions allowed our secret operatives to further illustrate the fact that the leaders were out for personal gain . . . Finally, by properly applied methods, the union charter was returned and the local abandoned.

. . . . The local union was disorganized, and that national industry, of which our client is the great majority, has not been unionized.

The book tells other stories of strikes no less successfully broken and of unions similarly wrecked. One clips sentences:

Our operatives have obtained positions of influence in the union so that they can easily influence the affairs within the organization in the proper direction for the welfare of the client.

. . . .

We had been successful in splitting the union into three factions, one controlled by the committee, one by a Polish leader, and one by the president . . . A meeting was called and the Italian employee whom our operative had been cultivating and influencing fought against the secretary. These matters resulted in a general fight. The proper time had arrived to exterminate the trouble-making organization. We detailed a number of guards and they were immediately deputized. Ejectment papers were served upon the committee and they were ordered to leave town, which they did. . . .

. . . .

Our operatives were successful in being able to take over virtually the entire management of the . . . union.

This book is indubitably the most instructive item in the library of industrial espionage literature. That it is so, certainly accounts for its withdrawal from circulation.

Following the Sherman Service advertisement: "How can Sherman Service be misunderstood?", is the whole welter of harmony and conciliation. Says Sherman, again:

No employer, no manufacturer or worker on earth need misconstrue our object.

No man, no organization, no movement that is honest and above board has anything to fear from Sherman Service.

This from the New York Times advertisement of November 5th, 1919. The motto of the R. J. Coach Secret Service Company of Cleveland is significant.

Man, know thyself, is a divine command, but, man, know those in whom you are obliged to put faith and trust is a human necessity without which no substantial success in this world can be achieved.

Mr. Coach may be taken as the originator of this literature of harmony through which the industrial detective advertises his wares.

In their silent, secret, effective way, the industrial operatives uproot relentlessly the weeds of dishonesty, disloyalty and discontent. Through their efforts unity of purpose is established between employer and employee. Our operatives soon end the reign of labor agitator in shop or factory. *We do not care to say more on this subject.*

All of this in the words of the industrial detective taken from his own works. His phrases in his parlance of harmony and conciliation—"we keep them happy and contented"—"We bring about a closer understanding between you and your employee"—"Give the human element more consideration"—"Selflessness, sincerity and honesty are the three factors which capital must use," are appalling. It is a strange thing to superimpose these noble thoughts upon the actual meaning behind them. But the final indictment of the industrial detective is the comparison of two passages gleaned again from the writings of Mr. Sherman's agency.

It is then a simple task to thoroughly impress upon the alien that this country offers advantages that no other country offers its citizens. We show him that he should be part of this country and enjoy its citizenship.

Against which the famous instructions to the operative of the steel strike:

We want you to stir up as much bad feeling as you possibly can between the Italians and the Serbians. Spread data among the Serbians that the Italians are going back to work. Call up every question you can in reference to racial hatred between these two nationalities.*

We cannot readily bring ourselves to associating this sort of thing with the employers of this country. Yet here is the industrial detective with his hundreds of branch offices and his thousands of spies and his income tax of $258,000 in a single year. Some one must pay the piper since he enjoys such prosperity.

SIDNEY HOWARD.

(To be continued)

*Publication of these instructions brought about a raid on the Chicago office of the Sherman Service, Inc., by the Military Intelligence and the States Attorney of Cook County which resulted in the indictment of an official of the agency. The indictment was subsequently quashed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Are We Out of Europe?

IT is the great illusion that we are out of Europe. Try to persuade an Englishman that we are out, that we have dismissed the present plight of the Old World with a gesture of indifference or by an argument about our constitutional limitation as to how far we can go in and he will speak to you something like this: "I am surprised. In Paris I find as many Americans as Englishmen in the corridors of my hotel. I hear your incisive expressive speech challenging the easy nonchalant tongue of our Islanders in the restaurants of Paris. If I go to Berlin, I see the alert features of your countrymen, outpacing the heavy visaged Germans on the Unter den Linden. I am told that there are hundreds of your citizens in every capital of Europe." So speaks your intelligent Englishman, man of the world, traveler, observer of Americans.

He is right. We are in Europe, everywhere from Warsaw, stricken with typhus, to Armenia, where life is cheaper than living, from Rome anxiously listening to the intermittent murmurs of revolution to Constantinople aroused from her eastern slumber by the clamor of western arms and policy. We are in these places in greater numbers than before, in numbers that astonish English observers.

Who are we that are there,—mere tourists? This summer in France, it is true, there were tourists by the thousands who came to visit the scene of Europe's recent agony either through curiosity or in solemn duty to seek the grave of a relative. Some found in France relaxation from the tumult of American life or the opportunity to overcome its aridity through a taste of European vintages. Few of such tourists crossed the Rhine. But when I say *we are in Europe,* I mean those thousands of Americans engaged in serious occupations who give in their presence abroad the character of the great illusion to all declaration concerning either our withdrawal or a traditional policy of isolation. Thousands of Americans are in Europe in interests purely commercial and financial. American firms are extending their business, establishing new industries, buying, invigorating with American methods defunct European enterprises. In every financial centre American banks are establishing branches. Conceive if you can any line of industry without its representatives in Europe. I cannot; leather, wool, cotton, automobiles, American department stores, tobacco, oil, electrical industries, drugs, chemical industries, sewing machines, typewriters, packers, railroad equipment and agricultural machinery are there. I know a man who is making large profits in buying hog casings in America for use in Europe; and sheep casings in Europe for use in America. His business is based on the taste of Europeans for the larger hog casings for their sausages and our preference to have sausages in smaller or sheep casings. I know this man has found a good business, for I helped him to make out his income tax returns.

The Red Cross still has men and women in the needed corners of Europe and in the Middle East fighting disease and repairing devastation. American Quakers have taken over the work of Mr. Hoover's relief in Germany and were feeding 600,000 German children a midday meal, when I was in Germany last September. Other American relief work is going on in the central European states; notably in Austria.

The most powerful group of Americans in Europe is the foreign correspondent. He is a new type of man; according to Walter Lippmann, "one who knows his way about in the world." Instead of a Richard Harding Davis today we have many such men, Strunsky, Selden, Draper, Levine, James, Grasty, Tuohy, Bell, Ruhl, Thompson, and Gibbons and many others. Nothing is more significant of how far America is in Europe than the development of American newspaper interests abroad. Before the war the special foreign correspondent was a costly luxury employed for the purpose of newspaper prestige. When the war began our Chicago newspapers gave it obscure mention in their editions. The one Chicago paper I have in mind now prides itself on its European service, and has at least a dozen men distributed throughout the continent of Europe and in London. Today all the enterprise, competition and vigor of American newspapermen in New York is duplicated in London or Paris. No American newspaper either in New York or Chicago with any care for its influence or importance is without special representation in any of the capitals of Europe. The equipment with which some of our big metropolitan newspapers liberally endow their correspondents might well serve as an example to the government itself in respect to the way our ambassadors should be outfitted for their work. Not only can you find elaborate suites of offices and corps of assistants, but three correspondents whom I know drive to the Quai d'Orsay, Wilhelmstrasse and Downing Street in automobiles supplied for them by their newspapers.

From Moscow to Cairo, from Teheran to Madrid, the watchful and critical eye of the American journalist describes the daily turn of events. The policy of Lenin as expounded by himself in the Kremlin, the nationalistic uprising in Egypt, the mistakes of Poland, the vicissitudes of the German government, each move of Lloyd George as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well as of Millerand are recorded daily by American citizens in Europe for Americans to read over their coffee at breakfast or in the subway as they go to work. Two American newspapers are published daily in Paris. They are fearless in their criticism of the French government, so much so that one for a time a year ago had certain privileges withdrawn from it. The owner of one of these papers came to Paris this spring for the purpose of winding up its affairs. But when he found that it was a paying proposition he decided to continue its publication. It would be a breach of confidence for me to give in actual figures the monthly cable bill of one of our big metropolitan newspapers. But I can say that it is enormous. You can gather some idea of what it amounts to by noting that for the most part much of what you read about Europe in your daily morning paper has been cabled to the United States at the cost of twenty cents a word. American newspapers are spending considerably more on their service abroad than for parallel service in America. Who knows better the things Americans are interested in than the managing editors who authorize this? Any event of more than local interest in Europe calls the American journalists to the spot. For example, one morning at ten o'clock in London I strolled into a British Labor Congress. I met there six American newspapermen, and but three or four British. Let any trouble start in Ireland and every New York paper will have its man on the scene inside of twelve hours if he is not there already.

All over Europe, stationed at strategic centres, is the American correspondent within reaching distance of anything that may happen. No sooner had the armistice terms been signed than three American correspondents got into a car and drove to Germany. They reached Berlin. Pershing heard of it, and asked Hindenburg to intern them. They were brought back under arrest and court martialed. But Pershing excused them and was reported to have said "Men, I am a soldier. I can't do those things. If I were you I would have done the same. Tell me about Germany—you're exonerated." These men were the forerunners of that great influx of Americans into Germany. By the protection of the State Department one cannot go, but if the military does not sanction one's mission, any German consul will. So, indeed, it has been with Russia. Mr. Washington Vanderlip affords an excellent example. In fact where and for what purpose are not Americans in the Old World, is the easier query to answer.

America has now become the creditor nation. Our cash advances to Europe total over ten billion. Private advances bring this figure to fourteen. We have promised to collect no interest for three years. At the end of that time it will be added to the total debt. If our government should demand liquidation in Europe we could not today get half of what is owed. Our private banks are in like situation. Morgan floated here $1,500,000,000 of loans for the Allies, preponderantly British, sold for the Allies in America approximately $2,000,000,000 worth of American securities, $1,500,000,000 of them owned by English and $500,000,000 by French, bought in orders from London commodities and munitions amounting to billions in dollars, maintained the exchange rates in London, Paris and Rome for three years. Foreign loans floated in America since the armistice amount to 700 million; advances for relief 700 million, whereas unfunded, commercial credits extended by American interests are $3,350,000,000. Some intimation of our foreign trade is carried in the announcement of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York that it had purchased over $500,000,000 acceptances representing export or import trade from January to August, 1920. The total foreign trade of the United States for the calendar year 1920 approximated fourteen billion dollars. It would be safe to say that the larger part of this was not paid for in cash but by advances from banks and American corporations on the sale of European securities in American markets. By far the larger part of the business of the bond exchanges and the great investment houses in marketing new bond issues was in the field of foreign government finance. In fact, American industrial financing has at times been quite driven from the financial market by the magnitude of these foreign operations. It is plain that the vision of our bankers has gone far ahead of our statesmen. They know that it is for us to help start the productive agencies of the world once again. And this year alone bears good testimony of their belief in the establishment of branches of our financial institutions in France, Belgium, Italy, Spain and other countries.

The fact is we are in Europe whether we will it or not. We are there in spite of our government. American industry, American capital, American relief, American journalism are there. These interests have so inextricably bound up America with the affairs of Europe that they can never be disentangled. No government could stand with folded arms if American citizens abroad needed protection. Imagine what would happen if our Red Cross nurses were ill-treated. Perhaps it needs some great urgency such as came to us in April, 1917, to formulate the policy in which we can

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

participate. We may be well assured that we have the agencies of our private work and enterprises leading the way if such call came. We are this time prepared. It matters little to these interests which have brought us into Europe what our formal association is. For the most part in those thousands of things which make up private international relations, whatever association Mr. Harding is able to offer, will be for them no more than legal sanction or moral support to the things that have been done already. He will merely make de jure what is not de facto.

The American government in its representative was not at Geneva, but the newspapermen were. There were bankers and lesser statesmen on the side lines who are citizens of the United States. Europe knows that our talk about constitutional safeguards has been the illusion. British diplomacy is aware of critical interested America. The trouble with Ireland, her Anglo-Japanese pact, her occasional use of the iron heel in India do not escape America's scrutiny. We are far afield of the prewar days when no one in Europe thought of asking the opinion of the United States on any question not directly affecting the continent of America, the Monroe Doctrine and the affairs in the Pacific Ocean. To be specific, Great Britain realizes our identity of interests with Canada and Australia in her Japanese pact. She has openly intimated that an agreement with America for the security of affairs in the Pacific Ocean would be preferable. In short, we are today the creditor nation, somewhat bungling in our manner because unused to such a free participation in international politics, but we are in all vital things now in the world affairs for good or ill as we choose to make it. It is the great illusion that we are not, and can stay out.

ANDREW TEN EYCK.

The Unemployment Crisis in England

IN the labor world of Great Britain one issue at the present moment overshadows all others. It is the question of unemployment. To all men over twenty-five the most familiar of industrial tragedies, it is to the generation which entered industry between 1912 and 1920 almost a novelty. The two years before August, 1914, were a period of quite abnormal economic activity. After a brief crisis between August and October, 1914, unemployment was virtually unknown throughout the war. The industrial problem which impressed the public was not the shortage of work, but the shortage of workers. The certainty that unemployment would recur, and recur in an aggravated form, was forgotten. Not a hint that a depression of trade might be expected was allowed to disturb the Christmas festivities of the general election. Even twelve months ago the press rang with articles on the necessity of increasing production. Employers and ministers painted pictures of a world-market which was hungry for British goods, and used these works of art to point their denunciations of the alleged wickedness of the British trade unionist in restricting production.

Today those sermons seem as remote and meaningless as the eloquence of wartime. For the first time for over ten years the spectre which haunted the working-class before the war has come to life. The percentage unemployed among trade unions making returns to the Ministry of Labor was 6.1 at the end of December last, or greater than at the end of any year since 1909. The number of workers on the "live" registers of the employment exchanges rose from 520,000 at the end of November to 927,000 on January 14th. In addition, there is wide-spread short-time; not less than 446,400 persons (and probably a good many more) were working four days or less per week at the same date. For the last few months London and other great towns have seen the old miserable processions of unemployed: here and there, led apparently by ex-soldiers, they have seized public buildings and declined to be dislodged by the authorities.

What public provision exists in Great Britain for meeting the crisis? As far as the state is concerned, it consists of the Unemployment Insurance act of 1920, which extended and amended Part II of the Insurance act of 1911. Under the act all persons over the age of sixteen, with certain exceptions, are compulsorily covered. Workmen, employers and the state contribute. The benefits payable, which begin after the first three days of unemployment, and are limited to a period of fifteen weeks in any one year, are fifteen shillings per week for men and twelve shillings per week for women, and half-time rates for persons under eighteen.

The Act of 1920 marked an advance in one respect. It brought the great majority of industrial and clerical workers within the scope of an insurance scheme. But, clearly, no one is going to accept fifteen shillings a week, which with the index number of the cost of living one hundred and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sixty per cent above the level of August, 1914, is less than the benefit of seven shillings, six pence, payable under the first, experimental Act of 1911, as meeting the claims of men who are so unfortunate as to be unemployed through no fault of their own. Some further provision must be made, and the most burning question of the moment is what form that provision is to take. The government is obviously in a state of the utmost embarrassment. On the one hand, the labor movement is knocking at the door. On the other hand, the country is in the throes of a campaign against expenditure. "Anti-waste" candidates are actually returned at bye-elections. If the government does not make any further provision for unemployment, it will embroil itself still further with labor. It must fight the new rich and the hosts of Mr. Bottomley, if it does.

What it has done so far is to set up a committee with power to distribute grants to local authorities which carry out approved schemes of useful work, and to recommend that employers, instead of dismissing workers, introduce short-time. The former has so far been ineffective, because the local authorities are themselves in financial difficulties. The latter policy has a superficial plausibility and a fundamental ineptitude which makes one suppose that it must have emanated from the very highest quarters in the cabinet.

In certain industries, like textiles and coal-mining, for instance, the workers have long adopted the policy of sharing the burden of bad times by means of short time, instead of allowing it to fall with crushing weight in the form of unemployment, upon some six to ten per cent of them. But this is, so to speak, a private arrangement adopted for equalizing sacrifices among the workers in these industries. It is not, and never has been, an alternative to labor's claim that the sacrifices of unemployment ought to be borne by the whole community, in proportion to the ability of different classes to pay, and that the whole system which threw it onto the shoulders of the class whose normal resources are least, is fundamentally wrong.

For the government to propose "to feed the dog on its own tail" by recommending that the earnings of all wage-earners shall be halved, is regarded, after the Prime Minister's declaration that the evils of the old industrial order must be ended, as a piece of intolerable effrontery. From an economic point of view the policy is singularly short-sighted. When a depression begins, as the Poor Law Commission pointed out long ago in its report of 1909, it tends to spread from industry to industry as the purchasing power of each group of consumers is cut down. Short time in the cotton trade means unemployment in the potteries, and unemployment in the potteries, a diminished demand for the products of a dozen other industries. The wise course would be to maintain the purchasing power of the great mass of consumers, even at the cost of somewhat attenuating the flow of the "savings" which are invested. The foreign market for British goods has been largely destroyed by the economic paralysis of central Europe, Russia and Ireland. The official program of universal short time would appear to involve the destruction of the home market as well.

The crisis has, however, had one good effect. It has brought all sections of the labor movement together. The Labor party repeatedly urged on the government during the war the necessity of preparing a scheme to deal with unemployment and had endeavored in Parliament to make the Unemployment act more adequate, only to be met with indifference or opposition. When the government, having waited till the last moment, invited it to appoint representatives to a commission to make belated inquiries, the party refused and prepared a report of its own, which is today being considered by a national conference. Naturally, in view of the present situation, it consists mainly of emergency measures, and does not represent the final judgment of the labor movement as to the way in which the periodical recurrence of bad trade should be met. But it shows a much clearer consciousness of the fundamental economic issues of the movement than anything which has yet appeared from any other source.

It is clear, for one thing, that the meaning of the government's foreign policy, which was always disliked by labor in so far as it was understood, but which the rank and file, unversed in foreign affairs, did not always realize as touching them very closely, is being driven home by the inevitable logic of personal suffering. An end to military adventures in Russia, Mesopotamia and Ireland, the immediate resumption of trade with Russia, the fixing of the German indemnity at a definite and reasonable figure, the provision of credits for central and eastern Europe—these proposals are not novel, but their setting is. They have been recommended repeatedly in the last two years by students of international affairs and economics. They are now related to the standard of life of millions of workmen in Great Britain. Once let that connection be driven home, as it will be when the Labor party's recommendations reach the rank and file of trade unionists, and the results will extend to spheres far beyond the immediate question of unemployment. If the present crisis continues, the issue of the next general election may well be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revenge, expansion and the other ornaments of a "spirited" foreign policy versus prosperity at home.

The immediate measures recommended by the report involve a frank reversal of the government's policy of sacrificing every other consideration (outside the sphere of Ireland and the War Office and Foreign Affairs) to the political terrors inspired by the paladins of the "anti-waste" campaign. The cabinet, in spite of protests in Parliament, insisted that the benefit for adult men under the Unemployment Insurance act should not exceed fifteen shillings per week. The Labor party proposed that it should be raised to forty shillings per week for men and twenty-five shillings for women, and that it should be payable when the workers' earnings are reduced by short time. The cabinet, thinking education the first proper object of public economy, has instructed Weal Authorities not to proceed with schemes involving increased expenditure. The result is that the building of schools is arrested, and the number of children entering industry is swollen at the very moment when adults are unemployed. The Labor party's report argues that "during a time of unemployment a deliberate attempt should be made to hold back from industry as many as possible of the rising generation," and demands, therefore, the raising of the school age, and the diversion of boys and girls away from industry and into education by the establishment of a greatly increased number of scholarships and maintenance allowances. The government has completely failed to carry out its housing policy, and, in particular, under the pressure of the building employer, has refused to allow Weal Authorities to place more than a small number of contracts with the new building "guilds." The Labor party urges that when, as now, both labor and plant are standing idle for want of orders, the right course is to employ them, not on artificially created "relief-works," but in making good the deficiencies caused by five years of war. Several hundred thousand more houses are needed; old schools require to be remodelled and new schools to be built; an immense effort will be needed to restore the equipment of the railway and canal service. All this work must be done some time. The wise policy, is to concentrate it, as far as practicable, in the lean years, and thus to use the purchasing power of public authorities to compensate for the fluctuations of private industry.

It is not likely that the Labor program will be accepted. What may come of the impact of the present crisis on the labor movement is, quite apart from these emergency measures, a more insistent demand that some permanent provision shall be made for unemployment and a more general agreement as to the form which such provision should take. The direction in which thought on the question is turning is that represented, for example, by the scheme for dealing with casual labor which was recently advanced by Mr. Bevan, the very able leader of the Transport Workers' Federation, by the program worked out eighteen months ago by a committee of employers and workmen in the building industry, or by the policy of the recently established building guilds. The essence of all these schemes, though in detail they differ materially, is that each industry should be required to maintain its own unemployed workers. Mr. Bevan proposed to pay dock workers four pounds a week throughout every week in the year, and to raise the necessary funds by a levy of four pence a ton on the goods handled. The building guilds stipulate in their contract that the local authority shall pay the cost of the house, *plus* forty pounds "to be used in paying wages to men when they are not working." In other industries the same result could be achieved by a compulsory levy on employers in proportion to their wage bills. It is toward some such solution as this that the mind of labor is now turning. If employers have to pay for unemployment, then, it is argued, they will take every measure in their power to reduce it, and it can hardly be doubted that, at any rate in some industries, they could by concerted action reduce it considerably. When unemployment is not prevented, the cost of it ought not to fall on the individual workman. The demand for that method of handling the problem has only recently been formulated, and, for most industries, its details still require to be worked out. But it will be enormously strengthened by the failure of the government to deal with the present crisis.

R. H. TAWNEY.

On Reading My Diary

This was the truth, as near as I could get it,
Although that truth is truth to me no longer.
But dead misapprehensions make me stronger
Who am infallible now and no more blind!
These mummied thoughts seem vivid and exciting:
For (like a vast percentage of mankind)
Myself's my self's main interest: so I find
Not one dull page in all these reams of writing.

"An egotist!" you say . . . Is that unusual? . . .
Show me the man, (provided he's a sound one,)
Who's totally assured that he's a dunce!
Such men are rare indeed: I've never found one;
But when I do I'll actuate him at once
Toward wholesome introspection. I'll advise him,
"Take samples of your grandiose delusion,
"And trace each complex down to its conclusion;
"Watch your reactions!" And within a week
He'll satisfy himself that he's unique.

SIEGFRIED SASSOON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Portrait of a Home Town

IT is of course the potteries which have made Hamerton prosperous, perhaps even famous, though Hamerton is not the only great pottery centre in the country; probably it is not the most important even in the middle west. But Hamerton understands publicity. It became known first for its white stone-china, producing this by the ton and quickly following with the highly profitable Queensware and glossy brown Rockingham for the kitchen. Then began the great era of the useful-ornamental. An enormous business was done in majolica urns, umbrella jars, jardinières, and similar articles in terra-cotta. Miscellaneous pieces of china were poured (well packed) into a yawning market; figurines, rose-jars, pin trays, toilet-ware, odd cups and saucers and fancy plates—very odd and very fancy—with lavish scroll gildings, flowers, cherubs, girlish faces, and all kinds of moulded configurations, knobs, handles, curled edges. Hand-painting in the home began to flourish, the plate-rail came into favor, and Hamerton did its best to accommodate. This exuberance was gradually toned down, as all know who have followed the fascinating gyrations in American taste. Hamerton, always open to change, began to produce ware which was almost excessively refined, with nearly invisible little sprays of fern or flower and a certain dainty sub-division and multiplication of dishes. The bone-dish appeared transiently.

Today the past, even this more recent past, is pretty well left behind. Hamerton is not sensitive about its commercial history, though if taunted it will argue and deny. It is well aware that its older production was part of a gross era, but it also knows that carpets, stoves, furniture, wall-paper have all gone through similar stages. It has had company; and now it is on the right industrial high road. It still does a discreet business in miscellaneous china, for the odd dish is not yet off the market, and it still makes a quantity of kitchen ware; but its main emphasis is upon practical, simple chinas and porcelains in "sets," with conventionalized designs and clear color. Its taste has become safe and guarded.

Even in the most thriving commercial cities the centre of life varies—and Hamerton is thriving. In some the heart of the place palpably beats in manufacture. Definitely localized in production are energy, purpose, even to the point of congestion. This is not true of Hamerton. In the first bright hey-day of the majolica umbrella-jar and the odd dish there must have been both fever and romance, but now there is neither. The potters display sound sense and unquestionable enterprise; their business is well rooted, they ship to points all over the two Americas, their markets will not easily slip away; the city is not only prosperous, it is rich, chiefly because of the potteries but also because of other industries which have gradually added themselves, foundries, mills, machine shops. Its wealth per capita is very high; it has had few bad failures. But Hamerton is a little detached from business. Commercial as it is, it can probably evade the reproach of a raw commercialism. Hamerton's real interests are elsewhere; it is a home town. Perhaps the making of dishes stimulates the domestic instincts. Perhaps the rather pretty country in the midst of which Hamerton lies suggests a pleasantly rooted existence. Some observers say that domesticity on the part of the workingmen has been deliberately cultivated as part of a labor policy. It is hard to strike on the partial payment plan, and there is no question that a good many factory-owners have made a good thing out of real estate on the side—in twenty-five to thirty foot lots. But then the working population comes mainly from a race which is naturally thrifty. Whatever the causes, there you have it! A consistent type, a fine flower of our middle-western civilization.

Hamerton is at the opposite pole from the substantial grime of the pottery towns which Arnold Bennett describes. Its potteries are scattered up and down the winding river, their gray-white truncated cones rising with a certain picturesqueness. None of them, none of the other factories and shops crowd upon the city. Even the large district pretty much given over to workmen's houses is neat and comfortable. The streets which skirt the mills are a little black, but they soon stretch off in trim rows. There are poor districts to be found, shabby districts, narrow streets of slant-lined houses. What city is without them? But they are comparatively few in Hamerton. The town has an effect of freshness, sun, good air, and in spite of the abundance of narrow lots it is fairly spacious, spreading out over a circlet of old farms and still keeping the remnants of country orchards in its gardens. It is tree-lined, and proud of its trees, its lawns are well kept, and in summer their brilliant green stretches along street after street. And the houses thus set off are not merely tenanted; Hamerton has one of the highest percentages of self-owned homes in the country. It excels in clean-up-your-back-yard, swat-the-fly, rake-up-the-leaves, plant-a-packet-of-seeds movements. It is actively concerned about health, and was one of the first middle-western cities to look after its water-supply. It has inaugurated a great variety of clinics; its infant mortality is low; its general

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

death-rate is low; it withstands the ravages of epidemics. These advantages may be due in part to an equable climate, but they are also the result of care. And Hamerton is also concerned with morality; it has no red light district. Within certain well-defined lines it is benevolent. It does not support general causes adequately, such as that of modern welfare work; but after the ancient private manner it looks after its poor, its sick, its aged, rather well. There is a large number of institutional homes in the city: an old man's home, an old woman's home, another home for the "aged," a home for gentle-women, a memorial home for both sexes, a home for the blind.

These masses of self-owned homes (private), well, they are not altogether charming, even though they are set among trees and shrubbery and along well-kept streets. In some of the poorer sections a few old plaster houses with simple gables have survived, homesteads of the pre-pottery days, reticently placed; but their tradition has not been continued. Houses are most often trenched down close to the street; the quick and easy route of standardization has been followed. Streets and streets show a few prevailing types: that made familiar by frequent photography last summer at Marion, Ohio; another which seems to be a late offspring of Georgian, with wooden trimmings and porches; another which is small and box-like, in frame. The last and most popular is of brick or cement or both, short but high-waisted, with a flaring base, colored trimmings and roofs, and a great variety of roof-lines. These houses look impregnable, like moated granges set along side by side. Severity with certain hardy effects in decoration now seems to be the general architectural course. A noticeable tendency has developed to strip off bulging porches and change windows, add a touch of colonialism, with a resultant air of purity and a lack of ease. Many of the country homes which are being built beyond the further fringes of the city produce much the same strict effect, though they go further afield for their styles. Their architecture is often impeccable, but they rest stiffly upon their sites; one wonders just how and why these were chosen.

Time, with careful landscaping, will doubtless attach them to the soil. Time is probably all that Hamerton needs. It has acquired houses; gradually it is acquiring all those proper modern articles of established pattern which belong to the proper American home, from four posters and Colonial sewing cabinets (copies) and tea-carts and billiard tables to expensive silver and rugs and even Barbizon paintings and Colonial originals. It is anxious to learn metropolitan social usages, and has learned them, so that its use of country clubs and its management of dinner parties is sophisticated and even charming. In matters of culture it is rapidly burgeoning with all those more or less exclusive little clubs and associations which keep the quiet provinces abreast of the times. It will relegate its more obvious crudities, probably rather quickly. It has the money; it will use it—for domestic improvement. Public enterprises, these are quite another matter. Hamerton has always been exceedingly thrifty about civic expenditure of any sort. It preserves certain decencies, particularly as these affect health, but it has never seen its way to large policies in the matter of parks, hospitals, recreation centres, social service, city planning. It pays its teachers badly; its library funds are meagre; it scamps appropriations whenever it can. Nor does it roll up public subscriptions.

But these latter days Hamerton has become a little sensitive and restless. War-taxation and war-giving have pried open its private purses, and though these have snapped firmly shut again, they may open next time more easily. The city seems to be developing a conscious pride; it has adopted a complacent motto, which suggests action, and it occasionally shows itself vulnerable when comparisons are made with other cities of its region. Comparisons—built upon a solid surplus—may generate some of those community possessions which are now lacking but which are coming to be as correct for the prosperous town as sewing-cabinets and tea-carts are for the prosperous home. Hamerton has proceeded from necessity to comfort, from comfort toward taste; it may also take the next stage, from domestic to social improvement, acquiring even an art gallery, a little theatre, an orchestra. Here it will probably stop. Some fine impersonal enthusiasm may flame up and sweep the town, but this seems doubtful. If the middle west is bursting and burning with enthusiasm, as it is supposed to be, then Hamerton is the great exception. High hopes do not flourish there, any more than in Gopher Prairie. They start, perhaps, by some chance contagion, but they are gradually questioned, modified, set to one side, diffused. Hamerton is not cold; and it nearly always preserves an air of good temper, interest, an open mind; it is "progressive." But it invariably plays safe.

It has had its Dionysiac period, when the clays were first discovered and potteries began to multiply and homes were built by the hundred, and this has closed over without a trace—except for the homes. It seems now to be establishing a new middle-western tradition for refinement and comfortable certitude, perhaps joining in a vanguard

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of cities which have left their hard-working days behind them and are settling down into something like opulence. It denies Gopher Prairie. Indeed except for its complacency, which is probably common to most prosperous American towns, it is essentially unlike Gopher Prairie, and perhaps always has been. It has no Main Street, but a criss-cross of rather well built city blocks. It is not crudely self-contained; it keeps acquisitive eyes fixed upon the outside world; it wants the best. It has been compared with some of the more agreeable New England towns, and it enjoys and fairly merits the tribute, in spite of a certain lack of finish. With its cleanliness, its apple trees, the easy sloping country round about, it has nearly all the pleasanter conditions for living—except a lively principle of growth.

I hate to contemplate the distilled culture and satisfied refinement toward which Hamerton seems cautiously to be heading. Not all of that naive gusto which filled the plate-rails can have been dissipated; Hamerton must still have an abundant energy if only this could be set free; and it has other solid assets: youth and health and money in the bank.

Reformers, civic diagnosticians, prescribe for Hamerton, save us from a final boredom! But don't merely tell us what we ought to be. Give us a working plan. Be practical, for we are wholly practical. Don't expect anything like the rise of a guild movement. Naturally the whole town ought to be compelled by the wish to make beautiful dishes, working passionately together like the cathedral makers of the middle ages; but we are not passionate, we seldom work together on anything, and there is little or no feeling for craftsmanship among us. Don't expect anything in the way of social reorganization from labor. When or if the social revolution comes it will come last to Hamerton. Unions are quiescent so far as they exist; labor has fought few battles. Labor is paying for its homes, buying sets of furniture on the instalment plan, helping its children to climb.

Don't of course disturb the home. And whatever you propose, be rapid and incisive, for Hamerton is already beginning to take on that rather brutal adiposity which sometimes comes to the prosperously domesticated; it may soon be immovable.

CONSTANCE MAYFIELD ROURKE.

Austria, Hungary and the Habsburgs

THE weapons of the Entente destroyed the old Austrian-Hungarian monarchy as a powerful state, and at the same time overthrew the oldest and most honored throne of the European continent—the throne of the Habsburgs. The Hofburg in Vienna, where the old Byzantine spirit was united with the mediæval Spanish spirit, stands empty, and even the Reparations Commission, which lived for a time in this haunted building, preferred modern bureau buildings to it. The Habsburgs went the same way as the Stuarts and the Bourbons.

Curiously enough, this downfall was regarded in quite a different light by Austrians and Hungarians, in Vienna and in Budapest. Viennese and Austrians, these people that had always followed their Kaiser with childish submission and had even in November, 1918, set up a democratic republic, had decided on a republican constitution, and have now taken as their first federal President Dr. Michael Hainisch, a buergerliche (middle-class) man of letters. But Hungary, on the other hand, the country of Rakoczy and Kossuth, that rebelled against the Habsburgs in secret agreement with the French, for nearly four hundred years, a people that is by nature free and unbound, seems to be working for the restoration of the House of Habsburg and the reestablishment of the monarchy. The roles are exchanged—in the year, 1849, the Magyars in the Debreczin Reichstag declared the House of Habsburg dethroned, and Austrian troops reerected it; in the year 1920, the Habsburgs lost the Austrian throne and the Magyars are arming legions in Zala Egerszeg, which shall reestablish them in Vienna. And the French, who intrigued with the Hungarians against the Habsburgs for four centuries, seem to desire their restoration!

Free Americans, to whom the Peace brought such heavy disappointments, surely want to have one satisfaction for their war sacrifices—the satisfaction of having freed Europe from the mediæval form of the state and of having brought democracy to the ascendant in Europe. And it might interest American readers to know whence come these contradictions, and what outlook the Habsburgs have for their reestablishment.

The proud Magyar race loves freedom—but still more does it love dominance. Since the invasion of the Hungarian plains, (896) when Attila's Huns and after them the Avars, threatened Europe, and for a time dominated it, this little people has always exercised great authority over its neighbors.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Their country has been a thoroughfare since the time of the barbarian invasions. Branches of five other races have remained within the walls of the Carpathians, Germans, Slovaks, Ukrainians, Rumanians, and Jugoslavs. The Magyars have always oppressed these races by force, first by means of feudal landlords, then by means of merchants and factory owners, lastly through royal officials. This domination was held to be praiseworthy by the culture of the century-old kingdom, and by the holy Crown of St. Stephan. This mythical culture finds its support in the geologico-geographical fact that the Magyars lie in the centre of a circle which, locked in by the mountain wall of the Carpathians, forms a natural unity for commerce, trade, economic life, and administration. And that has at all times been the minor conflict of the Magyars: internal freedom is not easy to reconcile with the desire for external domination.

After their defeat in the World War, the democratic elements in Hungary, under the leadership of Count Karolyi, wished to submit trustingly to the Entente, and especially to France, in the expectation of preserving their thousand-year-old kingdom even at the price of granting freedom to five other nationalities. The French general, Franchet d'Esperey, contemptuously thrust Karolyi back. Democracy despaired of itself and of the country; the disconcerted nation fell into the arms of Bolshevism; that was the first overwhelming surprise.

Bolshevism in Hungary, carried out by an absurdly small number of industrial workers, who are themselves a minority in the country, can only be understood as an outbreak of national despair. When the tidings penetrated to the Budapest Opera House, that a Soviet republic had been declared, the boxes clapped approval! Hungarian Communism fought a serious battle for its territorial integrity against Rumania and against the Czechs, and the social revolt of its neighbors served as an instrument of war in the national struggle. The arms of the Czechs and Jugoslavs broke Bolshevik rule in Budapest after three months.

This sad episode arose from a fatal illusion of the Magyar race; they thought to win back national dominion by social means; its cause, however, lay also in other circumstances, to which the world gave too little consideration. Firstly: In the senseless treatment of the nationality problem by the Peace Conference, and secondly, in the thoughtless treatment of an unhappy people by French militarism. True, it is only one mistake in the thousands that have been made since the great victory, only one small one, but it succeeded in plunging a country into anarchy.

And now follows the second surprise:

The imperial officers made use of the social disintegration brought about by the Communist Terror to intimidate the frightened citizens and peasants into supporting them; the land fell a prey to the "officer terror" and "officer dominance." And further, it is not alone the social anarchy which favors the dictation of the sword. The Habsburg officers and the Hungarian counts, who inspire them, created a new illusion. They will raise a brilliant army, the Hungarian king will be recalled. They will make the Hungarian king Emperor of Austria, and a united Hungary and Austria will resuscitate the old Empire. And again France plays an ominous part in all this, only this time in the opposite direction. French officers, bankers and journalists let those in power in Budapest know that France desires the restoration of the Danubian monarchy. Paleologue enters the Quai d'Orsay as Director, Paleologue, the old friend of the court of the Tsars, the political romanticist. He encourages the French bankers to give the uniformed rulers of Budapest the hope of unlimited credits, and Marshal Foch, so it is everywhere rumored, abets the undertaking. The whole Magyar nation once again deludes itself with rosy hopes. Magyar militarism feels that it is the outpost of civilization against the eastern barbarism of Bolshevism which is just marching against Poland. In all classes of the Magyar population it is whispered that at Gödöllö the French concluded a treaty for the territorial restoration of Hungary and the granting of unlimited credits, and on the Lake of Geneva, at Prangins, where the ex-Kaiser lives, great jubilation reigns. What needless, cruel deception of a people!

Seldom has a house of cards been so readily built and so readily destroyed. In Vienna, it is true, the Christian Socialist party encourages the adventure, but the young Austrian democracy stands firm. The Republican constitution is accepted, an indubitable Republican is elected President. Prague, Belgrade and Budapest hear of the plans that are made in Gödöllö, and take measures of defence; the Little Entente is formed; Beneš and Take Jonescu travel to Paris and blow over the house of cards. Paleologue gives way to Berthelot at the Quai d'Orsay, the alleged treaty of Gödöllö is denied, and the Little Entente announces that the return of a Habsburg would be for it a casus belli; the Peace of Neuilly must be ratified and the Hungarian army disarmed. The dream of the thousand-year-old empire has vanished. Poland has in the meantime thrust back the Bolshevik attack itself, and the Magyar outpost has become superfluous.

Was it necessary to play upon an unhappy nation twice in this way and thereby seriously unsettle four

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neighboring states at the same time? The policy of Gödöllö was a reckless adventure. It is now over; but the political convalescence of central Europe has again been retarded for a lengthy period. Gradually the Magyar is beginning to understand. The Hungarian peasant is beginning to resent this cruel game, the thoroughly reactionary Parliament itself is beginning to resist the recall of the Habsburgs, in so far as it dares to do so in face of the officer bands. But the army sits tight, and Horthy, a Habsburg general, is ruler of the Empire today. It is certain that the Habsburgs will not be able to establish themselves on the throne without a new civil war, but it seems just as certain, that the country cannot prevent this happening without a civil war. The intrigues of French military and financial circles have created a situation in Budapest which makes us think with foreboding of the coming spring. True, it is scarcely to be feared that the Habsburgs will come back, but that the peoples on the Danube are still far removed from internal and external peace is only too true.

KARL RENNER.

Before the Curtain Rises

BEFORE the orchestra strikes up for a new play the actors throng on the stage about the peep-hole in the curtain and in a flutter of nervousness "count the house" and seek to appraise the temper and the quality of the audience. They all do it. It satisfies some innate craving. The edges and rim of the peep-hole are always smeared with grease paint, the mark of eager questing faces. If when you are next in the theatre you will discover the peep-hole and watch it, you will be conscious, one after another, of the luminous, imploring eyes of the actors. They ask you to be kind. It cannot fail to touch your sympathy if you have any understanding of the perilous and insecure foothold of those who live by public favor.

Here at Washington it is the other way about. The annual subscribers to the national spectacle of government, who are a great number, and who have the same reserved seats season after season, are always eager for an advance and private view of the actor when the regular quadrennial change is made in the cast. But not this year; that is the surprising thing I have to report.

I assisted, in the admirable French phrase, at the inaugurals of Roosevelt, Taft and Wilson. I have, at least, that much background and knowledge of precedents on which to base a comparison of these last days of the Wilsonian era and the projections cast by the coming of the people chosen at the November elections. Always heretofore in the two or three weeks immediately preceding the ceremonial of inducting the new President into his office the demeanor of the community, participants and spectators alike, was marked by a buoyancy, an eager looking forward, a bright curiosity, a lifting and quickening of the senses as the new order drew nearer. There arose that little eager thrill that runs through an audience, whose expectations are high, before the rising of the curtain on a new play. Now all these usual signs and portents are missing, are undiscoverable to the most sensitive of questing analysts.

There is a certain touch of the old Athenian spirit about Washington. It loves new things, novelties, new people, new scenes and fresh interests. This is important because in time the Washington version and verdict is the one that is communicated to the country, and becomes a political force on which action is taken. I return to the theatre again for an analogy and comparison.

Suppose one of the chief producers of plays noted for the originality and freshness of his vehicles and their manner of representation, say Arthur Hopkins, should announce during the coming summer that he had arranged to present next winter with the original mountings, costumes and casts such sterling and familiar landmarks as, Leah, the Forsaken, Ten Nights in a Barroom, East Lynne, Two Orphans, New York by Gaslight, The Old Homestead and Uncle Tom's Cabin. His constituency and clientèle would know how a great part of Washington feels now as it awaits the immediately impending changes. When Harding was nominated I set down my belief in this journal that the Republicans had chosen to revive an old, old play with the original cast, but I did not suspect then with what minute fidelity to detail this impression was apparently to be verified.

It is that, I suspect, that makes for the present dullness and lack of buoyancy and expectation in the Washington atmosphere at this juncture, for it is undeniably dull and soggy. One has a sense of the last of pea time. Ordinarily there are two throbbing centres in Washington where authentic and valid impressions may be gathered. One is at the Capitol, particularly in the Senate wing, and the other in the White House. I have recently reflected as faithfully as I could the mixed emotions of the Senate as it awaits the incoming administration. For my own education I went to the White House offices one day this week. It is a place of quiet and stillness. Some two or three odd persons of no consequence sat on the leather covered benches in the ante-room and passages awaiting a word with Mr. Tumulty. The doors of the Presi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dent's circular office were open to all comers to see within that guarded precinct. Fresh flowers (pink carnations, if you are curious) were, as usual, in a tall glass vase on the desk. The room was spic and span and prepared as if the President might come in at any moment. The desk was bare of papers, and the little calendar of appointments was blank. The whole thing was like a scene preserved, but swept so clean of any little intimate things that no one could capture or recover any sense of personality. It just stands there all unmarked and unadorned waiting what may come. It was easy enough to people it with the ghosts of other days. When a President is functioning his offices are bursting with life. All manner of people are coming and going. The scene is instinct with vitality and color and movement. In it is compressed all that is salient in our national life. It is a place to sit for hours and days and absorb impressions. All of the people who come want something. They want, want, want and ask without end. They present the most vivid possible exhibition of the power of the President: his power to give, to bestow largesse. Every slight little contact with the President is a conference even though it reduces itself (as it so often does) to "will you please, Mr. President," and a flat "No" consuming not more than two or three minutes. I remember a man who wanted to be ambassador to Mexico who asked Mr. Wilson for three-quarters of an hour. He was granted five minutes. He was outside putting on his overcoat within four. He jumped the reservation at that moment and has never been heard of since. Scores of tense little histories like that might be written.

Less than a score of persons here have any definite first-hand knowledge of who will be in Mr. Harding's cabinet. The comment and the gossip I have to report here is based on what has been printed in the newspapers. The shrewd surmises of the correspondents with Mr. Harding are accepted. That accounts for the present general local impression that the "best minds" who were to select the cabinet have been engaged in sub-calibre practice because they feared or distrusted the big guns they were supposed to call into action.

"I am as tired of Hays as Postmaster General and Daugherty as Attorney General as I am of Burleson and Palmer. I feel that they have been here for years. They seem shopworn before they begin," is the type of thing one hears. And about Mr. Hughes: "He is Harding's idea of a highbrow, and so he was in 1904 and 1908, but he is an old model now. The styles have changed." Or as you may hear a senator say in their learned way, "He may be strong on the fortiter in re, but how about the suaviter in modo? Has he got it? An able man, certainly, but on what principle or basis is he now shadowed forth as a diplomatist?"

Or this literal transcript:

"Do you think he will put in Hoover?"

"Sure, he will. He's got to have Hoover. He will need him as formaldehyde."

Now this does a shocking injustice to the names that have been most bandied about, but I put it down simply to show how people here are talking among themselves; the color and plane of the gossip among the technicians and professionals who are so plentiful in Washington. The mocking surmise that if Mr. Davis, head of the Loyal Order of Moose, is selected for the cabinet it will be a subtle recognition of the Roosevelt element in the party, is another bitter jest in point. But enough of that.

It is odd and interesting the number of people one encounters who point out that Mr. Harding is all unconsciously projecting an image and painting a picture of himself and of his future in the series of misadventures that have marked his two efforts at a care-free holiday since the election. Quite normal persons profess half-ashamedly to read omens in the norther that swept Mr. Harding, cold, wretched and miserable away from the gulf coast, and in the mud banks that so continuously impeded his progress along the Indian river. What base ball players call a jinx, and firmly believe in, these Class B amateurs, psycho-analysts who have not quite learned the common complexes, have other and more formidable names for. It is just a part of the general atmosphere of waiting.

The whole state of mind that I have tried to indicate is induced by the clear recognition, not only here but elsewhere, that Mr. Harding must have a cabinet that will command respect and high prestige or go bust before he has had a fair chance. If he puts in a lot of second rate politicians and nobodies his administration will be politically bankrupt before it opens its doors for business. His friends know that. All the many people who wish him well know it. There is nobody who knows Mr. Harding, and who knows the problems that he must face at home and abroad as soon as he comes to Washington who does not recognize the imperative necessity that exists for a strong, able cabinet of men of prestige with an undivided interest in the public welfare.

I have taken all these words to say that the present fear in Washington is that he will not choose such a cabinet. As the sophisticated and experienced town seats itself preparatory to the rising of the curtain on the new play all the burden of the buzz of talk, as I catch it, is, "I am afraid this will

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be a bum show." I catch the same apprehensive note elsewhere as Mr. Ralston Hayden writes in The Weekly Review, with a fine restraint, "the Harding administration will need a touch of magic." If the advance notices are to be relied upon it will need much more than a touch of magic. It will need a full-bodied, high-powered miracle hitting on all six to keep it from stalling in the slough.

But I don't share in all this despondency, and even if I do, I don't admit it. Why not give the man a chance; a fair run for his money? He may show himself in a much better light, once he is in the White House, as others have done. Senator Aldrich, who, whatever his deficiencies as a friend of the plain people and the Ultimate Consumer, was a shrewd, experienced and highly intelligent human being, used to say that he had known three mediocre men who had been made really big, first-rate men by their development under the power and responsibilities of the presidency. He meant, of course, Cleveland, Harrison and McKinley.

Why not Harding? In common fairness, let's wait and see what happens.

Just now the time has come when, as Ben King wrote it:

> A noise arose in the orchestra
> As the leader drew across
> The intestines of the agile cat
> The tail of the noble horse.

I have only sought to interpret that confused sound without describing, or giving a verdict on the play which is yet to come.

EDWARD G. LOWRY.

Unknown Joy

You've seen a pool stirred by the wind,
Though by the pool unseen,
Or cloud caught in the waters' breast—
This was the joy I mean,

As could not come from wind or cloud
As of themselves alone,
But something stirred to meet the touch
Of something else unknown.

I shivered with joy like one amazed
To think such thing could be,
Then turned to see what thing it was
That caused this joy in me.

I never knew and could not find
What outward cause it had;
'Twas something in the hidden pool
That moved me to be glad.

ALICE CORBIN.

CORRESPONDENCE

The National Association of Manufacturers Puts Some Questions

SIR: Your publication, under date of January 26th, 1921, prints an article entitled Who is Behind the Open Shop Campaign? Its reputed author is Savel Zimand, described as "a member of the Bureau of Industrial Research of New York City." The article in question is a curious mélange of alleged fact and implication. It is apparently intended and, indeed, calculated to create in the mind of the reader an impression of systematic relationship between a variety of enumerated organizations in the furtherance of a campaign for the open shop. To this end, it assigns the office of leadership to some associations and the duty of interpretation to specific publications and of publicity to an individual whose name is given but whose relationship to the various organizations discussed is left to be implied from the physical construction of the article.

I cannot speak for other associations, but if the reference to them is as accurate as the alleged investigator makes to the National Association of Manufacturers, the medley is worthless. Possibly he would be willing to supply his authority for some of the following statements of the article:

1. Why does he describe Industry as "the organ interpreting the interests of the National Manufacturers Association"? Has he merely confused this publication of an individual with American Industries, the official organ of the Association from which he *does not quote?*

2. Why does he assign to the National Association of Manufacturers, by a plain implication, as a step in the open shop campaign, the direction of a convention held in Chicago, January 12th, "to unite the various forces working for the open shop in the United States"? And who are "the Associated Industries," to whom he refers as joint directors?

3. Who is Thomas J. Sullivan, referred to as the "Director of Publicity," to cover the American press for the open shop? Since it is clearly indicated that the individual named is part, and an important part, of a systematic open shop campaign, possibly Mr. Zimand will inform us to what association or group of associations he is attributable.

I make these inquiries in the interest of accuracy. They might readily be extended to other statements of the article, but a reply to these ought to indicate the reliability of one who is apparently a professional investigator. Indeed, the title of his connection, The Bureau of Industrial Research of New York City, might well lead the uninformed to believe that he occupies a public position.

At the present moment so many loose statements are being made respecting "open shop" campaigns that it seems in the public interest to examine the responsibility of one to whom your well-known publication lends its columns.

JAMES A. EMERY,
Counsel, National Association of Manufacturers.

Washington, D. C.

Mr. Zimand Replies

SIR:

Question I.

Mr. Emery's first question answers itself. Had I intended to refer to American Industries, the official organ of the N. A. of M., I should have done so. Mr. Emery correctly interprets my statement.

Question II.

(a) Neither directly nor by implication did I assign the "direction of a convention held in Chicago on January 12th" to the N. A. of M. What I said was that "the campaign, (i. e., the open shop campaign) is being directed by the N. A. of M., etc." Again Mr. Emery's question shows that to him my meaning was quite clear.

(b) The Associated Industries is a title common to open shop, anti-union organizations distributed throughout the country. Mr. Emery will be able to get more detailed information by writing to the Associated Industries of Seattle, Washington; Associated Industries of Paterson, New Jersey; Associated In-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dustries of Montana, Butte, Montana, etc.

Question III.

The following U. P. dispatch answers Mr. Emery's third question:

"Chicago, Nov. 26.—(By U. P.)—A propaganda barrage, nationwide in scope, against the closed shop, was launched here today with the opening of national headquarters of the American Press Bureau.

The fight to throw all shops open to non-union labor and trade unionists follows closely the announcement of the American Federation of Labor that it will fight to the limit any effort of manufacturers to kill the closed shop plan.

Thomas J. Sullivan, director of publicity of the American Press Bureau, said his organization was formed for promoting better relations between the employer and the worker and that the new scheme of things will mean the elimination of the closed shop.'

'We are not opposed to organized labor,' said Sullivan, 'but are against the closed shop. Labor is entitled to fair treatment; so is the boss. Strikes and boycotts must cease. Those who have the closed shop have very little to say about the conduct of their own business. Labor must be educated that the open shop is the best way to promote friendly relations between it and the employer.'

Sullivan said over 1,200 chambers of commerce over the country have gone on record favoring the open shop.

The American Press Bureau, according to Sullivan, is to distribute propaganda advocating the open shop to newspapers and magazines all over the country.

The cost is to be borne by manufacturers who will be asked to contribute to the upkeep of the bureau, according to Sullivan.

Plans include preparing and sending out propaganda designed to warn the public against unions."

SAVEL ZIMAND.

New York City.

Two Letters Defending A Supreme Court Decision

SIR: For some time I have been noticing the different tendency in your publication. Until recently, while being somewhat advanced in thought, you have been thoroughly fair and not partisan, but liberal in the broad sense of the term.

I am sorry to see that now in dealing with current events which do not satisfy you, you are inclined to be unfair and to distort and suppress essential facts. In this way your paper is assuming the appearance of radical propaganda.

It is so much to be regretted because there isn't anything left to take the place of the old, broad, fair-minded New Republic.

The latest illustration is in your current issue of January 26th where you deal most unfairly and insincerely with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on the Clayton act. It isn't necessary to characterize your unwarranted remarks concerning the Supreme Court; they speak for themselves. But you do suppress entirely one of the fundamental things in the Supreme Court decision, namely, the showing that it was the expressed will of Congress as voiced by the chairman of the committee reporting the bill on the floor of the House that the bill should mean only what the Supreme Court has now held it to mean. It could not have passed Congress if it had been supposed to mean anything else.

There was no such delusion and trickery as you insinuate. There was the utmost frankness and publicity along these lines. What really happened, however, was that Gompers and the labor unions and people like yourselves apparently thought that by clever word juggling, Congress had been deceived into adopting an act which meant something different than it thought. This was really the now very apparent reason for the Gompers's jubilation to which you refer; and the present bitterness in labor circles and in your own publication is quite evidently due to the fact that it has at last been found out that the combination did not succeed in putting anything over as it thought.

At any rate, why you should take such an absolutely unfair and distorted position and suppress entirely one of the most important things in the Supreme Court's opinion is incomprehensible to any lover of fair play and truth.

WARREN D. CHASE.

Plantsville, Connecticut.

SIR: While wholly in sympathy with the spirit of your editorial on The Law and Labor in your issue of January 26th, I am quite sure that you have misled your readers who have not seen the decision of the Supreme Court when you state (p. 246) that "the Supreme Court now decides that the effort of the New York machinists *by not working on Duplex presses* to secure union conditions for their fellow machinists in the Duplex Company's plant and thereby to maintain their own union conditions elsewhere is not a case 'growing out of a dispute concerning terms or conditions of employment.'"

The impression which this sentence and others following leave upon the reader's mind is that what was enjoined was the actions of New York machinists in interfering at some stage of the process of installing the Duplex machines. You make no reference to the secondary boycott. My own reading of the decision leads me to think that Justice Pitney was more impressed with the attempts of the New York machinists to interfere with the business of customers of the Duplex Company and to incite trouble between these companies and their employees. He refers again and again to these secondary acts of interference and says, "To instigate a sympathetic strike in aid of a secondary boycott cannot be deemed 'peaceful and lawful' persuasion."

I would like to see the law what Justice Brandeis believes it now to be—a declaration of the right of industrial combatants to push their struggle to the limits of the justification of self-interest,—but nothing is to be gained by a discussion of the issue in which significant considerations are omitted.

FRANK HAIGH DIXON.

Princeton University.

An Answer from the New Republic

[Mr. Chase says "that it was the expressed will of Congress as voiced by the Chairman of the Committee reporting the bill on the floor of the House that the bill should mean only what the Supreme Court has now held it to mean." Mr. Chase, we are sure, will agree that the final and authentic expression of the "will of Congress" must be found in the language of a statute. If it be true that in the Clayton act Congress unequivocally expressed its will to "mean only what the Supreme Court has now held it to mean," does it not seem strange to a lawyer like Mr. Chase that thirteen federal judges should have divided seven to six as to "the expressed will of Congress." Moreover, will informed professional opinion deny that the six judges with whom Mr. Chase disagrees, Holmes, Brandeis, Clarke, Hough, Learned Hand and Manton, are, man to man, as equipped to interpret "the expressed will of Congress" as White, McKenna, Day, Van Devanter, Pitney, McReynolds and Rogers, the judges with whom Mr. Chase agrees? Surely there must be an ambiguity, to say the least, in the language of the Clayton act; or else there is implicit in Mr. Chase's remarks an imputation upon the intelligence and the character of the judges who disagree with him, such as we very clearly negatived with reference to the judges who disagree with us.

But Mr. Chase makes a specific charge of unfairness against the New Republic, based upon our failure to make reference to "one of the most important things in the Supreme Court's opinion," namely, the statement of Chairman Webb of the House Committee that the proposed bill did not legalize "a secondary boycott." In discussing the Duplex decision we did scrupulously refrain from any consideration of "boycotts." We did so for the same reason which, doubtless actuated the minority opinion in omitting all mention of it, namely, that it was entirely irrelevant to the issues of the case. What were the questions before the Supreme Court? Not at all whether "boycotts," "primary" or "secondary," are legalized by the Clayton act. There isn't a mention of "boycotts" in the Section (20) of the Clayton act which the Court had before it for interpretation. Section 20 enumerates a list of "acts specified" *e.g.,*

> "terminating any relation of employment or . . . ceasing to perform any work or labor or . . . recommending, advising or persuading others by peaceful means so to do . . ."

which Congress declared shall not be considered "violations of any law of the United States." Congress further declared that no injunction shall issue restraining the doing of these acts. We repeat, not a word about "boycotts." The questions before the Supreme Court, therefore, were, first, whether the Act specifically complained of by the Duplex Company were such as Congress had specifically withdrawn from the injunctive process;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and secondly, whether the defendants, the New York unionists, could avail themselves of the protection of the Act. Specifically, the case before the Supreme Court was, simply and concretely, whether New York machinists could, in concert and through the persuasion of others, refuse to work on machines of the Duplex Company, manufactured under non-union conditions, as a means of protecting the more favorable union conditions for machinists in other printing-press factories competing with the Duplex. The majority said "no," because it held the case did not grow "out of a dispute concerning terms or conditions of employment," and because the protection of the act, as they read it, is restricted to the acts of workers directly in the employer's employ. The minority said "yes," because on the facts they found that the dispute *did* concern the conditions of employment of one of the parties, and because, in their view, Congress did not restrict the provisions of the Clayton act to employers and workmen "in their employ."

In view of Professor Dixon's letter, we repeat that the crux of the case, *the* ground on which the injunction was sought, was the interference by New York unionists with work in New York on Duplex machines, in aid of a strike declared against the Duplex Company in Battle Creek. The facts as set forth by the lower court leave no doubt that such was the issue. Indeed, Professor Dixon himself finds that "Justice Pitney was more impressed with the attempts of the New York machinists to interfere with the business of customers of the Duplex Company." But that is precisely what we mean by the concerted effort of New York machinists not to work, and to persuade others not to work, on Duplex presses. This is the familiar case of refusing to work upon non-union made goods within the same industry. But just as soon as Mr. Justice Pitney and Professor Dixon speak of "the secondary boycott," they leave definiteness for ambiguity, they confound things with labels. We may agree or disagree upon the issue whether unionists in New York should be allowed to exercise their economic coercion by seeking to interfere with the installation of Duplex presses as part of an industrial conflict between the Duplex Company and the union. If we so frame the issue at least we are talking about the same thing. But as soon as we talk about "secondary boycott," we are involved in a confusion of terms and necessarily, therefore, in a confusion of thought. We insist, therefore, on sticking to the *facts* in the Duplex case, as they were formulated by counsel and submitted for the disposition of the Court.

It is not a technical point we are making. The meaning of a statute must be found primarily and ultimately from its own terms. Sometimes, of course, technical terms are used which have a content of established meaning. No such situation is presented by the Clayton act. Mr. Chase will agree to the necessity of holding professional opinion to the exact professional issue if confusion of thought is to be avoided. And why? Because substituting terms not used for terms used is to substitute extraneous opinion for the truly expressed Congressional will. Congress could easily have dealt specifically with "boycotts." It did not do so, and for the very good reason that there is contrariety of opinion as to what is a "boycott" and what "boycotts" can be enjoined. Professor Dixon and Mr. Chase surely know that the Supreme Court itself has recognized how greatly Courts differ about "boycotts." Congress did not use this ambiguous term, but preferred enumeration of specified acts, not subject to conflicting interpretations. Our correspondents and the majority opinion discuss "secondary boycotts" and thereby falsify the issue. To hold that the Clayton act does not legalize "secondary boycotts" still leaves open the whole controversy as to what constitutes a "secondary boycott." And that is precisely the controversy which Congress did not leave open Congress specifically sought to eliminate the conflicting personal opinions of judges as to what is, and what is not, allowable in the tactics of industrial conflict, by cataloging itself a list of legitimate tactics. It is wholly unlawyerlike to substitute another category, particularly a most contentious one, and disregard the enumeration by Congress. The Supreme Court has had occasion to expose the fallacy of this method of reasoning. "As long as the matter to be considered is debated in artificial terms there is danger of being led by a technical definition to apply a certain name, and then to deduce consequences which have no relation to the grounds on which the name was applied." We repeat, because the matter is of the essence, that the issue and the only issue before, the Supreme Court was whether a strike by New York machinists on non-union made Duplex machines of Battle Creek, Michigan, was or was not within the permissive acts set forth in detail by Section 20 of the Clayton act. "The flowers that bloom in the Spring have nothing to do with the case"—and neither has the "secondary boycott," whatever that may mean.

As a matter of fact, the New Republic has never had any illusion about the Clayton act. From the beginning we have had occasion, again and again, to forecast the result which has now been registered by the Supreme Court. If Mr. Chase will turn, for instance, to the files of this paper for December 2, 1916, and the discussion which followed in the issue of December 9, 1916, he will see that we made perfectly clear the legal problems raised by the Clayton act, and constantly urged upon labor to pin no hopes upon that measure. But in considering the questions raised by the Duplex case we must discuss the *legal* issues raised by the Clayton act. And we adhere to our conclusion that, while the Clayton act involved ambiguities, due to the dishonesties of legislation, elementary legal principles required the Court to resolve the ambiguities so as to give meaning to an Act of Congress and not to bury it. THE EDITORS.]

"The Group Mind"

SIR: Perhaps you will allow a Scottish reader to express his surprise at Mr. Walter Lippmann's review of Mr. McDougall's Group Mind in your issue of December 15th. I happened to get the review a few days after a first perusal of Mr. McDougall's book, and, with a little knowledge of the foundations which the author had laid for his work, more particularly in his Introduction to Social Psychology, but also in studies of the tribes of Borneo, of Animism, and of Body and Mind, it was rather astonishing to find a reviewer of Mr. Lippmann's calibre and equipment ignoring the preliminaries, or asking that they be all stated over again.

The keystone of Mr. Lippmann's polemic, which is eked out by a copious use of suggestion of the depreciatory sort, lies in the following: "Mr. McDougall defines mind as 'an organized system of interacting mental psychic forces.' As I understand this you can speak of a collective mind when a number of individuals are reacting upon each other in something more than a carnal relation. You call it a 'collective mind' although you must try at the same time to remember that anything you know about it *is known only through individual minds*. This seems to me a confusion of the logical with the psychological. It is like saying that *the rules of chess and the moves being made under those rules are the collective mind of two men playing chess*. You can call it that if you like. But what you have done is to use a word that connotes the psychic process (the players' efforts?) to denote a logical system (the rules of the game?) And if you insist upon regarding the logical system as the subject of your study you may possibly learn a lot about the rules of chess, but you will not learn anything about the psychology of the chess players. Mr. McDougall's group mind is not a psychological fact at all. . . . He cannot take it apart, and show how it is put together or how it works." (Words in brackets and italics mine.)

Surely Mr. Lippmann's predilections and a half-digested illustration have led him astray. Chess players are a select group, with a peculiar mind, the psychology of which is territory imperfectly explored. The rules of chess are the product of a group mind with a history, tradition, and mental tendencies which appeal to one in a thousand possibly, the rare possessors of a certain combination of instinctive and intellectual qualities, which unites them in acceptance of rules slowly acquired by generations of players, of a civilized sense of sportsmanship, combined with a due admixture of the instinct of pugnacity, love of approbation, and so on. Their geographical boundaries may be non-existent, but their social inheritance is on a par with the language, literature, traditions, institutions, and other local influences which enmesh and mould every citizen from his earliest days. If in the one case acceptance is voluntary adhesion to a somewhat rigid set of rules, and in the other a predestined human lot ranging from the Hottentot of Haytian endowment upwards, the fact remains that both constitute as excellent an example of a group mind as Mr. McDougall could wish for the purposes of his exposition.

Mr. Lippmann would apparently ask as a guide to sociology a disembodied spirit, free from attachments of flesh and blood, of family or country, and with a blank mind as to the contemporary

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

values of what we have reached, which is like asking for a poet who had never loved or suffered. Because he is annoyed at many of Mr. McDougall's judgments, he need not have led or misled your readers into supposing that the sequel to the invaluable Social Psychology is a mere piece of pamphleteering.

Let me say in conclusion that I have no acquaintance or relation one way or another with Mr. McDougall except such as is derived from the study of his books. J. S. ROBERTSON.

Glasgow, Scotland.

[One way to study chess is to see what combinations 32 pieces moving on 64 squares according to the rules of their movement produce. That is an interesting thing to do. But it is not the psychology of chess. Another thing to do is what Mr. Robertson attempts that is to describe what attracts people to chess, what goes on in their minds under different conditions, and how they behave. That would be a psychological view of chess. That is what Mr. McDougall began in regard to groups in his Introduction. But in his Group Mind he has, I think, tried to deal with groups not as a social psychologist, but as an anthropologist, biologist, ethnologist, or statistician, and without too many scruples about waiting for the evidence.

Mr. Robertson is mistaken in supposing that my criticism was due to annoyance because I disagreed with Mr. McDougall's judgments. I was annoyed because these large generalizations are pseudo-science of the kind that prevailed in Germany before the war. As dinner table conversation I should agree with many of Mr. McDougall's particular prejudices for there people talk at large anyway. But I should expect to recognize them as prejudices talked at large. I happen, for example, to like the English better than any other foreign people, but I do not regard that preference as a profound contribution to social psychology.

Nor do I ask for "disembodied spirit in sociology." I do ask for an objective and critical spirit, vividly and permanently aware of its preferences and of "contemporary values," and with that noblesse oblige which keeps the true scientist ever alert to discount and expiate his own desires. How does science differ from propaganda except in this? And from whom, more than the scientists themselves, have we a right to demand the effort to practice reason? W. L.]

The Black Record of J. E. Spingarn

SIR: Stuart P. Sherman has sized up Mr. J. E. Spingarn. He says he is an "artistic secessionist," "anxious to secede from the major efforts of his countrymen," and that he would know more about American literature if he had more intercourse with the men "who bear the burden of the state, or are widely conversant with its business, or preside over its religious, moral, or educational undertakings."

Here is his black record. Here's the way he has tried to secede from the major efforts of his countrymen:

EDUCATION: He was a professor at Columbia for a dozen years or more, with an international reputation as a scholar, but did he get on well with Nicholas Murray Butler?

POLITICS: He has been in politics for twenty years, has run for Congress, been a delegate to state and national conventions, confabbed with all the bigwigs of the country, and enjoyed the political and personal friendship of an American President, but is he an Old Guard Republican?

BUSINESS: He is a director in two (or is it three?) big corporations, vice-president of a publishing firm, trustee of some large estates, but does he believe in the Sacredness of Capital?

AGRICULTURAL LIFE: He votes in a rural district, owns a country newspaper, belongs to the local and state Grange, started a nation-wide movement in rural recreation, but how much money has he made out of his own farm?

WAR: He was a major of infantry in the A. E. F., serving as a battalion commander and on the staff, but does he believe in a large standing army?

SOCIAL WELFARE: He has tackled the one big problem most Americans don't care to face, and acted for years as chairman at the Natioanl Association for the Advancement of Colored People, but isn't helping the Negro encouraging "social equality"?

RELIGION: He has respected and studied the faith of others no less than his own, and spoken in churches and religious organizations of nearly every denomination in America, but does he believe in the divine right of Puritanism?

LITERATURE: I won't mention his books (not even the long dull poem glorifying America that John Hay praised and I found unreadable), but does he believe that every poem, play, and novel should end with a "moral"?

He is found out! What can he possibly know about American life or letters?

XYZ

A Child on the Doorstep

SIR: I awaited with interest and curiosity your reaction to the new reparations proposals. In your issue of February 9th we have it. You say, "This reparation total is a fit child of the Treaty of Versailles. . . . If there are still leaders among the Republicans who are inclined to swallow the Treaty as it is, the absurd bill just presented to Germany should once and for all convince them that no possible, no sensible arrangement of reparation can be born from it."

Is this quite candid?

You have urged the revision of the Treaty of Versailles. In particular you have wanted the reparations sum definitely fixed. You have joined in the agitation of which these new and impossible proposals are the outcome. You have what you have wanted. On reflection you decide that you don't like it. So you disown and abandon the child, discover and leave it on the doorstep of the Treaty of Versailles.

Let me rewrite the last paragraph of your editorial.

"If there are still leaders among the liberals who are inclined to swallow the notion that the Treaty of Versailles would have been better if it had set the reparation payments at a fixed maximum sum rather than a fixed minimum (with wholly improbable additions), the absurd bill just presented to Germany should once and for all convince them that no possible, no sensible, maximum sum could have been agreed upon."

ALLYN A. YOUNG.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

[We have wanted a revision of the Treaty of Versailles and the definite fixing of the reparations at a figure that offers some prospect that they will be paid. These "new and impossible proposals" are not what we wanted; neither do they seem to us a result of the agitation for fixing the indemnity—the indemnity was to be fixed by May 1920, according to the Treaty and some proposals, possible or impossible, were due. Nor do these proposals fix the indemnity, but combine a series of annual payments—in excess of possibility and therefore indefinite—with a series of wholly indefinite payments through a tax on exports. This child will have to look for another doorstep than ours.

As for the superiority of the "fixed minimum (with wholly impossible additions) we should have supported it if the minimum had really been a minimum and the additions wholly improbable. But those are the points at issue. The Treaty left the Allies with the power to starve or enslave Germany, according to their preferences. That is why the Allies are in a position to make such demands as those embodied in the agreement of the Premiers. THE EDITORS.]

Preventive Justice

SIR: As to your recent excellent editorials on The Declaratory Judgment and Preventive Justice, and the action of the Michigan Supreme Court in rejecting the thought that "it is the duty of the state through its courts to furnish advice to its citizens," it may interest your readers to learn that it has long been the practice in the Massachusetts General Court, in Legislature assembled, whenever the question of the constitutionality of a proposed law is raised, to ask the Supreme Court for its opinion as to its constitutionality. In this way much trouble and vexation has been avoided. In advising the Legislature the Supreme Court has thus, of course, also advised the citizens through their representatives. This action seems quite in line with the principle of the "declaratory judgment," which saves individual citizens the same sort of trouble and expense concerning the legality of proposed activities that is saved in regard to the agreement of proposed laws with the fundamental law of the Commonwealth.

San Juan, Porto Rico. SYLVESTER BAXTER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Irrepressible Farmer

SIR: Since even the able editor of the Non-Partisan Leader missed clean the sole point to my discussion of The Irrepressible Farmer, it must follow that the point was so dully made as to be generally overlooked. It is a point of some importance, it seems to me, and I hate to see it lost. May I try to resuscitate it in a stickful of words?

My premise was that the farmers, in the west at least, have at last become socially effective. My conclusion was that, having learned to act together, the farmers are now changing and in future will change the balance of economic and political power to their advantage. The article was intended solely as evidence of this view.

I tried to show that the farmers are going to their mark by whatever means, political or economic or both, they find handy. They prefer economic, but have no scruples against political measures. If its opponents spiked the Nonpartisan League, for instance, the farmers would merely shoot with some other gun. Here, apparently, is where I got in bad with Mr. Morris. He thought that idea marked me a vile propagandist slickly suggesting to farmers the perfect safety of letting Mr. Morris's organization die. I had thought I was merely warning its adversaries that their name is Dennis whether they kill this particular organization or not. I was not considering the interests of any farmer organization, but only the prosperity of the farmers. I wasn't saying through what church they must find salvation. I was only noting the signs that by one means or another they are going to be saved. WALTER LOCKE.

Lincoln, Nebraska.

Pots and Kettles

SIR: When the ex-Kaiser made the much-quoted comment that Lord Northcliffe won the war he merely gave the word "propaganda" a name. In other words he paid a tribute to the immense power of the press in swaying public opinion, and, by implication, admitted that it was morale, and not personnel, which is the ultimate factor to a country's success in war, morale as bolstered up or torn down by the press.

The anonymous British politician, who, incidentally, was unable to find a bushel large enough to hide his light from the ferret-like leader-writers, stirred up an international hornet's nest by re-echoing the ex-Kaiser's conclusion, although perhaps from a slightly different angle and, foolishly, at a time when international sore spots are at their tenderest. Consequently, instead of laughing at such an obvious "break," as Austen Chamberlain was laughed at and probably rapped over the knuckles and told not to make a fool of himself again, the leader-writers have hotly resented "England's impudence," have asserted that "America is apt to resent quite sharply any 'bullying' from whatever quarter it comes," and have seized the opportunity to slam, in the name of America, England's Irish and other policies.

It will be seen, therefore, that this well-meaning anonymous British person has done precisely that thing which he was endeavoring to undo. The inevitable reaction of touchy resentment will be observed on the other side of the Atlantic and the press of the nations will begin shrieking "You're another!" heedless of, or, worse, in full recognition of, the enormity of its power in shaping the opinions of the great public. Through individuals it will pass on to groups like an infectious disease.

If the public could see farther than its nose the whole thing would be nothing but a stupid bévue. Unfortunately, however, it is because the public not only suffers from myopia but is remarkable for the shortness of its nasal appendage that Northcliffe—and by implication presumably Hearst and Bottomley—have aroused the ex-Kaiser's admiration. The public has not yet learned to differentiate between the individual voice and the group voice. When a leader writer, in his usual ex-cathedra manner, says "we," the public thinks that the whole country is speaking. It cannot get it into its thick head that a leader writer is no divinely appointed being with an Olympian aloofness, but is just an ordinary citizen struggling, like everybody else, with his income tax returns, trying to keep up appearances, to make both ends meet, and wielding a pontifical pen as a means to that end.

The following quotation from a leading daily is a perfect example of the individual speaking with a group voice. "If Ambassador Geddes has in mind the Irish issue, it may as well be admitted that a large section of American opinion believes that the British government's course in Ireland has been shameful . . . And *America will continue to say so* no matter how harshly it grates upon official ears in London." What the writer meant to say was simply that he and other individuals in the newspaper game would take every opportunity of expressing, in print, their personal views and sympathies on the Irish tragedy. This the public does not grasp.

"America" has passed prohibition. But suppose there should be a referendum on that question?

"America" did not fling the British flag into the mud outside the White House some months ago and trample on it; nor, more recently, did "America" demand that it should be hauled down from the Union Club next door to St. Patrick's cathedral. But a few isolated citizens expressed a momentary exaltation in that manner.

"America" did not subscribe to the first bond issue of the Irish republic. But there were many usually unoccupied ladies who found occupations by sitting in the foyers of many of the best hotels and selling Irish bonds.

Consider what yellow headlines could be made of these by a Northcliffe who wanted to break down the good feeling between the two countries, to set brother against brother and bring catastrophe upon a world still dazed by the impact of the last blow! War between England and America is unthinkable, and because one misguided Englishman makes a fool of himself it is to pile the Pilion of unintelligence upon the Ossa of stupidity for the press to scare-headline the untrue fact that *England* has said this or said that. Both England and America, in a national sense, are strained to the utmost to solve the mightiest problem of the present century. It is no time to confuse values.

Boston, Massachusetts. A. HAMILTON GIBBS.

The Disposition of Western Thrace

SIR: It is widely recognized today by all internationally-minded citizens in Europe that peace can only come to the distracted Balkan States by a revision of the Paris treaties. A dozen or more English publicists, all of them experts on the tangled ethnographic and economic questions of the Balkan Peninsula, have recently issued an appeal in Britain concerning the revision of the unjust treaty of Neuilly and the disposition of Western Thrace. I trust that you may find space in the New Republic for the publication of the following appeal.

Montclair, N. J. WILL S. MONROE.

We, the undersigned, desire to urge that, in the interests of international peace, the question of the disposal of Western Thrace should be reconsidered. The cession of Western Thrace to Greece was injust and unwise for two reasons:

1. Two-thirds of the population were bitterly opposed to it. During the French occupation of this province, they clearly expressed their views, and since the Greek occupation a large proportion of them have taken refuge in Bulgaria.

2. It cut off Bulgaria from her only territorial outlet to the Ægean Sea, without which her economic life cannot be fully developed, and this although Bulgaria had signed the Peace Treaty on the strength of the understanding that this territory should be placed under International control. Without such access Bulgaria will be thrown back on the Central Powers for the provision of its economic needs.

A commercial outlet through Greek territory can never be satisfactory, owing to the intense hostility which has always prevailed and which, unfortunately, still prevails between Bulgarians and Greeks.

The present situation in Greece, and the widespread demand among our Allies for a revision of the Treaty of Sèvres, appear to us to provide a favorable opportunity for making a fresh settlement in Thrace, and we respectfully urge upon H. M. Government and the League of Nations the desirability, in the interests of future peace, of satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the large non-Greek majority, both Christian and Moslem.

H. Conyers Surtees (*Major-General*), R. W. Seton-Watson, George Young, Edward Gleichen (*Major-General*), Leonard Woolf, J. Ramsay MacDonald, A. G. Gardiner, Noel Buxton, Edgar G. Lister, V. de Bunsen, H. M. Wallis, J. M. Kenworthy (*Lt.-Commander R. N., M. P.*), Henry W. Nevinson, M. E. Durham, Leland Buxton, H. N. Brailsford.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Things

IT was Mr. Arnold Bennett, then on his first visit to the United States, whose artful and emphatic praise of Sister Carrie brought many of us acquainted with Mr. Dreiser. By 1900, the year when Sister Carrie was published, Nature, Nurture & Co. had every reason for thinking they had succeeded in fitting us to enjoy this able novel, which nevertheless we somehow contrived to miss. But for Mr. Bennett's arrival and intervention our ignorance might have lasted longer yet than ten or twelve years. He has a passion for compelling novel readers to turn back and take an interest in good work misprized. In his eyes a neglected talent is as new as the talent that is this day published. He is always doing for us what he did in Sister Carrie's case. I wonder whether he hasn't just done it again? In Things That Have Interested Me, which I've not yet seen in book form but from which I read some extracts a few months ago in the London Mercury, Mr. Bennett speaks of the bond that begins to tie you to a chance acquaintance when you discover that you both like some work of art, plastic or literary, of which appreciators are far too few. He gives several examples, this among others: "Similarly will a bond be created if you ask a man where is the finest modern English prose and he replies: 'In The Revolution in Tanner's Lane.'"

Of course the chances are against your being in accordance with Mr. Bennett after you have read The Revolution in Tanner's Lane. What of it? Were you less grateful to him, if he it was who persuaded you to read The Way of All Flesh, because you couldn't, upon "rising from the perusal" of that odd and original novel, for the life of you understand why he called it "one of the great novels of the world"? If you so much as remembered, at that moment, the overemphasis of that praise, I take it for granted that you remembered also how intentionally Mr. Bennett's emphasis gives aid to his persuasiveness. Sometimes he says his say with a bang, crudely—"one of the great novels of the world." Sometimes, as now, he says it without quite committing himself to the defence forever, against all comers, of the thesis that "the finest modern English prose" is to be found nowhere outside The Revolution in Tanner's Lane. Sometimes he very much doesn't say it with flowers, as here: "Now, the pleasurable sensations induced by the fortieth chapter of Isaiah are among the sensations usually induced by high-class poetry. The writer of it was a very great poet, and what he wrote is a very great poem." However he says it, his object is always practical, always the same: to make you read something you have not read or else reread something you have not appreciated.

The finest modern English prose is not in The Revolution in Tanner's Lane. What makes me sure of this is a conviction that the finest modern English prose is not in any one place. It is in many places. There are moments when I ask myself whether at any other time, since English literature was, the living writers of fine prose were so many? It is because they are many that the purpose I had in mind, upon beginning this article, has already grown infirm. I meant to enter several horses against Mr. Bennett's entry, the late William Hale White, and to let each of them give us a glimpse of his or her form by running a sentence or two. How can one get into a single page quotations from the living men and women whose prose is fine art, from Max Beerbohm, Joseph Conrad, R. B. Cunninghame Graham, C. E. Montague, George Moore, Bertrand Russell, George Santayana, Lytton Strachey, Virginia Woolf, William Butler Yeats, to name only all I happen to think of whose texture short quotations wouldn't too grotesquely misrepresent? The list looks foolishly exclusive as soon as I have made it. Any list is bound to look foolish, most of all one which omits the author of such a passage as this: "When I say that a thing is true, I mean that I cannot help believing it. I am stating an experience as to which there is no choice. But as there are many things that I cannot help doing that the universe can, I do not venture to assume that my inabilities in the way of thought are inabilities of the universe. I therefore define the truth as the system of my limitations, and leave absolute truth for those who are better equipped." This quotation is taken almost at random, it is from a thinker the scope and quality of whose mind can no more be inferred from brief passages than Mr. Santayana's mind or Mr. Bertrand Russell's, but are not these four sentences enough to convince any competent judge, who happens to be looking for "the finest modern English prose," that he had better look, among other places, in Collected Legal Papers, by Oliver Wendell Holmes?

To go back, however, to The Revolution in Tanner's Lane, the number of whose American readers Mr. Bennett will be found, within a few weeks or a few months, to have greatly increased. Its author, William Hale White, has been dead not quite eight years. He was contractor to the British Admiralty, he translated Spinoza's Ethics, he published, under the pseudonym Mark Rutherford, several novels besides The Revolution—Miriam's Schooling, Clara Hopgood, Catherine Furze, Mark Rutherford's Deliverance, The Autobiography of Mark Rutherford, all of which may be bought in a cheap edition from the Oxford University Press. Their theme is nearly always "the internal struggle of a soul which is called on by the accident of its surroundnngs or its early training to grapple with problems it will not leave untouched and is not equal to solving." Their scene is English market towns, near the middle of the last century. Mark Rutherford writes not without malice, yet "so measured are his words that a dull man might even doubt whether any such malice was intended. This quality of style, this deliberate veiling of mischievous humor in a way which effectually hides it from the perception of a hearer or reader without *esprit,* is what Plato makes the enemies of Socrates call his 'irony'; it is never absent for long from the pages of Mark Rutherford, and I doubt whether his finest work will appeal greatly to a reader who is not himself an 'ironical' man. He would have said, perhaps, that the 'ironical' write only for their fellows."

Add to Mr. Bennett's praise these quotations—taken from a lecture by Mr. A. E. Taylor, in June, 1913, before the Dundee Branch of the English Association, published in Volume V of the Association's Essays and Studies, Clarendon Press—and you have, I hope, the ingredients of curiosity as to Mark Rutherford's novels. I know I have. When I first read Mr. Taylor's lecture, a few years ago, I felt a curiosity which Mr. Bennett's words have revived and bettered and almost persuaded me to satisfy. Almost, not quite, for such a curiosity, however agreeably instilled, is one among several competing curiosities. It has not yet survived the final round. And there are many fields wherein one may wander and look for the finest modern English prose.

P. L.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Aesthetic Attitude

The Aesthetic Attitude, by Herbert Sidney Langfeld. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.

FOR a long time I have wanted to read a good book on aesthetics, as an obvious preliminary to discovering what lies behind ordinary criticism, if anything, and perhaps as a preliminary to becoming a high priest myself. This book does not precisely fill the bill. It is, I imagine, an easy one to start with. The nucleus of it is formed of lectures delivered to students at Harvard, and the book itself is "intended for the general reader." But if this be aesthetics, give me some easy little thing like quoternions. I feel as if I were a dog that had been trying to open an oyster with his paws.

But is it really an oyster, with the pearl of beauty inside it, or only a bit of the sea-rock that the oyster imitates? This is what a critic should be able to answer. I can't. I recognize a good many of the words with which the book is studded—reaction, data, fundamental, function, technique, values, complex, pragmatic, stimulus, dynamic, realistic, form, content. These are in themselves imposing words, especially when they come forward with new associates like "psychical distance," and "empathy," but I have used them too often on my own account to be sure they mean anything. Similarly with Mr. Langfeld's use of the word pattern, and his fluent talk about motor theory, response, the organism, etc. Similarly with his references to Theodor Lipps, Konrad Lange, Yrjoe Hirn, Adolf Zeising and the rest. If these big guns support his fine dictum, "the ideal of aesthetics should be a vigorously scientific one," all right. But I confess that I have no great confidence that such is the situation. In spite of all this apparatus, I feel that his book is solid only in the way that a stage setting is solid. It doesn't do to lean on it.

To give a reason for this conclusion is difficult because much that Mr. Langfeld says is impeccable. "A change in mental attitude produces a change in the art object, and a change in the object through some external necessity frequently produces a change in the mental attitude." This is certainly balanced utterance warranted to wear, and so is the typical announcement, "It should be the legitimate aim of aesthetics to generalize and to use the results of such generalization as a guide, but the rules thus obtained must be continually tested in experience, and altered according to the conditions thus found." Who would deny this? But who, on the other hand, would lean on it? It wouldn't support an intellectual tom-tit. And non-support becomes more serious in a passage like this: "A certain balance depending upon circumstances must therefore be maintained between the two sources of the appeal, that of the form and that of the content. Unless the formal is not prominent the art will not stand much content, and conversely, if there is little content, there will be a limited field of aesthetic influence unless the form is made sufficiently evident, as is the case in decorative designs and music which depend almost entirely upon their formal appeal." In this last quotation the phrase, "unless the formal is not prominent the art will not stand much content," seems to me a hollow mockery. What does it mean? Is it, as I suppose, one of Mr. Langfeld's many failures to think in the English language? But a dozen such examples of utterance too thin or too thick would not dispose of any book. The real failure I am seeking to analyze in The Aesthetic Attitude is a failure to produce the interpretative goods.

Let me illustrate. Mr. Langfeld starts out to find the "relation" on which the nature of beauty depends. He picks up "Münsterberg's idea that "complete repose in the object" and "complete satisfaction in the object" with the object in "complete isolation" sums up "the enjoyment of beauty." (Why does it not equally sum up the enjoyment of goodness or truth? But that is an aside.) Now Mr. Langfeld, with a certain captiousness, says: "It may be admitted, then, that there are in the two words, detachment and isolation, some valuable suggestions. When, however, Münsterberg says that there is repose in the object of aesthetic enjoyment, he most decidedly contradicts the facts. It has been shown that all perception—and aesthetic experience certainly falls under that term—involves active participation on the part of the observer." The word repose is the supposedly contradictory word. Can one "repose" in the object of aesthetic enjoyment? How can one repose if perception is *active* participation?

So Mr. Langfeld, who does not actually "repose" confidence in Münsterberg, thinks the word must imply fat inertness. Nevertheless, three pages later, he is saying "the one form [of repose] is a fact and essential to aesthetic enjoyment, but no more so than to any other complete perception." This rounding on the point after "most decidedly contradicts the facts" is not my idea of "vigorously scientific" aesthetics.

Nor is it vigorous to take Dr. Bullough's phrase, "psychical distance" and say, "In one place, Dr. Bullough uses the term 'detachment,' but, after all, the name is of little importance, inasmuch as he makes his underlying meaning fairly clear by well-chosen examples." Is this science? In point of fact, Dr. Bullough's illustration might apply to a condition of concentration underlying the scientific attitude just as much as the aesthetic attitude. This Mr. Langfeld does not observe. "When one views an object aesthetically, one lives in the object in the sense that one allows oneself to be entirely swayed by the laws of the object without any opposition upon one's own part." Quite true, if "the laws of the object" means anything definite. But this phrase is equally descriptive of such ardencies as shoe-shining. To be of much use, a definition should be exclusive.

Again, on one page, "the aesthetic attitude may be likened to rowing downstream with the current and following all of its windings," and yet "in the truly aesthetic participation, one is swayed back and forth by the conflicting forces." These contrasts are picturesque, but are they "vigorously scientific"? I find them no more so than Mr. Langfeld's uncritical assumption as to one's "usual attitude" toward one's environment. "The aesthetic attitude as thus described is diametrically opposed to one's usual attitude toward one's environment, the one which one learns to assume by reason of the struggle for existence. In this latter attitude, we are continually opposing forces." This is paving the way to the announcement that "there is present in appreciation a feeling of make-believe" and "a truly aesthetic enjoyment demands a sense of unreality." But before accepting this notion that escape is the prime aesthetic object I want more facts, especially when I find Mr. Langfeld dovetailing this talk of "unreality" into his ill-digested notions of psycho-analysis. "The sense of unreality relieves us of the necessity of rationalization." This is to fit in with the idea that "the work

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of art must be of such a nature that we can find expression for our wishes in it."

I know that this is a fascinating path of inquiry. I know also that a beer bottle in one of Cézanne's still life pictures is sometimes supposed to be ferociously phallic. But to proceed as if these things are actually proved is not vigorously scientific. It is flabby, windy and woozy. Besides, it departs from a useful etiquette. A man who never hints how much he knows or how little, who never admits the tentative character of his speculations, is bound to mislead some of his readers. And are we ready to imply that if there were no suppressed desires and wishes, there would be no enjoyment of beauty? Perhaps Mr. Langfeld does not believe this, but his examination of paintings with complete attention to motor adjustment as indicated by the form, without any regard whatever to color, arouses an enormous suspicion as to his scientific adequacy. He has four or five chapters on paintings alone, in which he gives no sign that he has ever seen one of these paintings. He talks of his black and white reproductions, indeed, as if they were the actual paintings. This omission of an integral factor in the objects of which he is discoursing not only upsets one's confidence in his thoroughness. It makes one wonder how responsible he is in this whole matter of motor response. The "desires of the organism" do undoubtedly play their part in the enjoyment of beauty. But how can that part be estimated if we talk of painting and omit color? To do this is to deal oneself all the trumps, like the believers in economic determinism.

Much more could be said on this score, just as much could be said about such valuable dicta as "it is necessary to meet the existing thoughts and desires at least halfway . . . There is little value in an art that is doomed to empty galleries and halls. Even the plays of Shakespeare at the present time have not the hold upon the people," etc. But enough has been said to indicate that Mr. Langfeld has much knowledge but no more profundity than to reduce all aesthetics to the platitude that if you like something, that is the sort of thing that you like. ("If we find the proportions of our dwellings entirely satisfactory, it is because they are in harmony with our predominating modes of response, or what is the same thing in other terms, because the proportions express our personality.") This is pragmatic, possibly, but I still believe that there is more in the science of beauty than rotating on the axis of platitude. But the man to realize this is not the man who thinks in the Babu English that devastates the post-graduate mind.

F. H.

A Chronicle of Facts

Our War with Germany. A History, by John Spencer Bassett. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

PROFESSOR BASSETT has written an undramatic account of our war with Germany, by relating, in the main in chronological order, the "facts" of a more or less external and obvious sort. If one wishes to know what our neutral trade-right dispute with Great Britain was, out of what concrete cases the dispute arose, what the formal defense of the British government was and what the reply of the Secretary of State; if one wishes similar information about our dispute with Germany; about our preparations for war, the organization of our national resources, the sending of the Expeditionary Forces, or the military and naval engagements in which our troops took part; in a word, if one wishes factual information about our part in the great war, presented without bombast, with restraint, with accuracy (so far as accuracy was possible in 1919), with attention to perspective and relative importance, this will be a useful book to refer to. But one must not expect any extended discussion of the causes of the war, any searching analysis of facts or ideas, any illuminating interpretation of the course of events. The author refrains, deliberately I take it, from attempting anything of this sort. "It is from the standpoint of the historian," he says, "that I have endeavored to tell the story of the struggle." I suppose this means that he aimed to relate the events in narrative form, with a minimum of discussion and without obtruding his opinions on the reader: he aimed to give us the facts, and to let them "speak for themselves."

This is a worthy ideal; but, strictly speaking, unattainable in a narrative story of events. Facts are so wretchedly complacent, so indifferent, so neutral in word and deed, that they speak a various language. It is all one to them; they don't care what they say. Indeed, it is not, after all, the facts that speak for themselves when connected in narrative form; it is the author's selection and arrangement of the facts; it is the author's phraseology; the "whereases" and the "therefores" and the "notwithstandings"; it is all this that does the speaking. The most detached and objective historian in the world has at least one preconception, which is that he must have no preconceptions.

Thus it happens that Professor Bassett gives us more than a wealth of concrete information about the war; in spite of the best intentions, he gives us a kind of interpretation also. Aiming always at the strict truth, he is greatly preoccupied with the duty of being impartial, with making sure that "no injustice is done to any person or cause." The result is that he is disposed, wherever possible, to set one fact off against another, to balance one opinion or policy against the opposite opinion or policy, and to pronounce only very carefully guarded judgments himself whenever it seems essential to pronounce any. This is all admirable in itself, but it has its dangers too. It inclines the author to avoid controversial questions and crucial difficulties as much as possible, and, where this cannot be done, to try to find, by searching out safe neutral ground, a kind of reconciling via media.

I do not at all mean that Professor Bassett is neutral as between the United States and Germany. His history obviously justifies the United States in making war against Germany; but the justification seems to lie just in the fact that we did make war against Germany. Similarly, by allowing the facts to speak for themselves, Professor Bassett seems to make them say that President Wilson was, on the whole and all things considered, right in keeping us out of the war as long as he did keep us out, in taking us in when he did take us in, in getting us out when he got us out, in proclaiming the ideals which he in fact proclaimed, and in making the peace which he in fact made. The author does not explicitly affirm this; but the President was necessarily so much in the centre of things that the very course of events, when narrated factually, carries him as it were triumphantly along at every stage. This is the way things happened, we seem to hear Professor Bassett say, and so this is probably about the way things had to happen. The reconciling via media is always most conveniently found in accomplished fact. The mere "fact," if you allow the wretched creature to open its mouth, will say only one thing: "I am, therefore I am right."

It is an author's privilege to reveal or to conceal his opinions; but I wish Professor Bassett might have selected

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and arranged his facts in a way calculated to make the reader a little less complacent in his own opinions. I wish he had not made it so easy for the reader to slip without a scratch over all the rough places. Without committing himself he might, for example, have called the reader's attention to what was perhaps the most fundamental of the President's inconsistencies (not that any mortal man can be without inconsistencies). In January, 1917, the President said that the realization of the great ideal which was the basis of his policy, the ideal of a new international order which would end war and make the world safe for democracy, required a "peace without victory. . . . Victory would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed upon the vanquished. . . . Only a peace between equals can last." Personally, I think this was the truest thing he ever said. But whether true or not is irrelevant; the President affirmed it in the most explicit and solemn manner. Now the war ended with Germany vanquished; the peace was "forced upon the loser, victor's terms imposed upon the vanquished." This was the very peace which the President said could not last, the very victory which he affirmed would make it impossible to establish the new international order. Nevertheless, he went on to establish the lasting peace, the new order, as if nothing had occurred to make it impossible, and afterwards affirmed that the Treaty of Versailles was that peace, and that the League was that new order. I do not say that the war could have ended otherwise than it did, or that, "all things considered," a different peace than the Peace of Versailles could have been made. But I say that if the President was right in 1917 he was wrong in 1919. If the President changed his mind about peace without victory sometime between 1917 and 1919, it would be interesting to know why.

These are facts too. They are perfectly willing to speak for themselves; properly introduced, they will speak with great eloquence. But Professor Bassett seems partial to facts that speak a more prosaic language.

CARL BECKER.

The Shadow

The Shadow, by Mary White Ovington. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.

BENJAMIN BRAWLEY in a searching essay of some years ago called our attention to the "mob spirit in literature" which prevents our seriously touching the drama of the American Negro.

> As a matter of fact, the Negro in his problems and strivings offers to American writers the greatest opportunity that could possibly be given to them today. . . . One can only imagine what a Victor Hugo, detached and philosophical, would have done with such a theme in a novel. . . . And yet, with the Civil War fifty years in the distance, not one novel or one short story of the first rank has found its inspiration in this great theme. Instead of such work we have consistently had traditional tales, political tracts, and lurid melodramas.

What is true of literature is true of art: here with a tenth of us colored, we see a colored face in an illustration, a painting or a bronze, on the stage or in a movie but rarely, and then usually in obvious caricature.

The reason is clear. We Americans have settled the race problem and we will not have our settlement tampered with. The truth of Art tampers. That is its mission. We refuse, however, even to conceive a black hero and white heroine, a white hero and black heroine. Too, we are impatient at "colored" grades in any relation to whites. And in characters wholly black we are frankly uninterested. The result is obvious: authors who aspire to be "best sellers" seek to avoid the race question, art or no art.

But it cannot be wholly avoided, being a dark and exceedingly stubborn, a sinister and an amazing fact. In which case for a long time we tried to embalm the past or preach about the future: we painted and repainted the glory of a type of Negro long since dead or we ranted about the inevitable character and fate of the present Negro, so long as, like Tom Dixon, we followed the lead of the Mob.

So much for the past. But there are signs of change and The Shadow is a bright one. Miss Ovington in her novel on the race problem has avoided the chief difficulty of her task by making her heroine white in blood and only colored by adoption. This gains for Hertha immediately a sympathy which no Negro could claim from most American white readers. Former writers who have hit on this expedient have then overshot the mark by making the attendant Negroes as miserable and worthless as possible. If Miss Ovington were merely a propagandist in this work—and I hesitated to read it because I feared she was—she would have swung to the other extreme and made Hertha's Negro "relatives" paragons of goodness. With much skill and resulting readableness the author avoids this and the real art of the novel lies in the fact that this white girl's life conflict lies in the fight between her wish to be free and white and her deep-seated affection for her colored family. No matter what the truth may be, in Hertha's thought Ellen is a sister, Tom a big, sweet-hearted child and "mammy" a mother.

Here Miss Ovington touches with sure hand the crux of this human problem. Most folk are torn in such a case in two ways: if Negroes are human and sensitive as we are, Americans say, the horror of their situation is such boundless tragedy that sheer self-defence forbids any discussion of it on our part in poetry, essay or fiction. If on the other hand they do not feel their situation, then they are not human as we are, and why should I enlighten or arouse them even if that were possible? Miss Ovington's novel simply suggests that one who knew some of them intimately, was, rightly or wrongly so sure of their common humanity and endless suffering that the knowledge of it brought cataclysm to her own life.

The tragedy then which the book especially emphasizes is, that between these races so old in their acquaintanceship and so close in common life, between them today there can be no friendships. Tom is aghast to think of a place where he can talk simply to his white foster sister and the attempt to tell her news of his mother's death nearly brings a lynching. On the other side the plight of the whites is equally tragic: the race hatred of Dick, the "poor white", is a piteous disease and madness, and the life struggle of landlord Merryvale begins rather than ends with his marriage to Hertha.

How curiously complicated it all is! What a treasure house for the story teller does Miss Ovington again open to us—but the Mob—the Mob!

The Negro himself, the author touches with delicate restraint. She does not attempt the racial conflict of Charles Chesnut's Marrow of Tradition or the inner analysis of Jessie Fauset's Emmy and The Sleeper Wakes—knowing that such penetralia are only for those born to the Veil.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But she has written a deft and deeply interesting human story which, with its knitting up of the problems of labor and race, is perhaps even more a novel for the enlightenment of blacks than of whites. And for both, its ultimate message is as simple as it is true, no matter how much the Heathen rage:

"'Dearie,' the Irishwoman replied, 'you talk as if color were a state of mind.'

"'Isn't it?' Hertha asked."

W. E. BURGHARDT DUBOIS.

The Golden Bird

The Golden Bird, by Dorothy Easton. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

MISS EASTON'S sketches (there are forty-four of them in less than three hundred pages of text) are marked by an extraordinary sensitivity. Quite often they are the mere depiction of moods occasioned by some aspect of scenery or atmosphere, but always they are alive to the heart of the reader. She reacts emotionally, often in a poignant manner, to everything with which she comes in contact and the result is a book that is deeply satisfying. Sudden vivid comments on life spring to her from a Sussex twilight, the sight of an old mill, the memories of a lover's walk. The earth tells her things and her sharp sense of values never deserts her at crucial moments.

Beyond all things must be commended her powers of characterization. These types that she introduces into her short pieces are drawn with sparing brushwork, but they undoubtedly live before the reader. It is her powers of objectivity that make these pictures stand out like snapshots. Often they are more than snapshots, for she gets beneath the visual aspects and presents the undefinable essence of the character. Who can forget the Misses Jellicoe after they have been introduced through three of Miss Easton's sketches? The writer might be compared to a Japanese artist. With a minimum of lines she scores the maximum of effect.

Now and then with a simplicity that but heightens the effect of the theme she presents a tragedy. These tragedies are concentrated but they score their effect all the more by this method of presentation. Who can forget Frog's Hole or Transformation or Heart-Breaker? An effective psychology is manifest in some of the sketches, Transformation being an adequate example. There is an understanding of the heart, a sudden catching of tentative gestures and half-realized fears that is surprising.

Miss Easton's prose is always adequate for the prose and theme of a sketch must always be essential virtues of the successful sketch. This prose is often the prose of a poet, lovely suggestive pictures suddenly flashed before the reader, tiny symbolic manifestations unobstrusively making their appearance.

Mr. Galsworthy's short introduction to the book is simple and direct. As he points out while the sketch is considered one of the easiest modes of writing the good sketch is extremely difficult to do. Mr. Galsworthy says, "The good sketcher does not bite off more than he or she can chew, does not waste a word, and renders into writing that alone which is significant. To catch the flying values of life, and convey them to other minds and hearts in a few pages of picture may seem easy to the lay reader, but is, I do assure him, mortal hard." Miss Easton comes through this test in a triumphant fashion. Her book is compact with authentic literary values and will find its greatest appeal among the true epicureans of letters.

H. S. G.

Selected Current Books

Great American Issues, by John Hays Hammond and Jeremiah W. Jenks. Scribners.
Problems of government, labor and business are here presented in what is termed a "constructive" study.

The Art of Letters, by Robert Lynd. Scribners.
A handsome volume of contemporary and retrospective literary essays by the Irish critic. Dedicated to J. C. Squire.

French Civilization, by Albert Léon Guérard. Houghton Mifflin.
Traces French civilization from its origin to the close of the Middle Ages.

While Europe Waits for Peace, by Pierrepont B. Noyes. Macmillan.
A short account of "the progress of economic and political demoralization in Europe during the year of American hesitation," by the American Rhineland Commissioner, April 1919 to June 1920.

The Lost Girl, by D. H. Lawrence. Seltzer.
The "old maid" is indicated as the theme of this novel.

"Left Wing" Communism, by N. Lenin. The Marxian Educational Society, Detroit, Mich.
A diagnosis by Lenin of what he calls "an infantile disorder."

Life and Letters, by J. C. Squire. Doran.
A variety of essays that first appeared in Land and Water.

Contributors

ANDREW TEN EYCK is a lawyer and writer on foreign affairs whose contributions relating to the American diplomatic service have been recognized as of great importance. He has recently returned from an extended trip abroad. Mr. Ten Eyck has been awarded the diploma of the French government for study of the legal system of France, economics, constitutional and international law at the University of Paris.

R. H. TAWNEY, English lecturer and author, was a sergeant in the 22nd S. B. Manchester Regiment. He is the author of The Acquisitive Society.

CONSTANCE MAYFIELD ROURKE is a literary critic who has frequently contributed to the New Republic.

KARL RENNER was formerly State Chancellor and Foreign Minister of the Austrian Republic.

EDWARD G. LOWRY was formerly Managing Editor of the New York Evening Post. He served in the diplomatic and military service of the United States during the war.

SIDNEY HOWARD is a graduate of the University of California, where he was a student under Carleton H. Parker. He served with the American Ambulance in France and the Balkans a year before the United States entered the war. He afterwards held the rank of Captain in the U. S. Air Service, and was Flight Commander of the 20th Aero Squadron. He brought down three German planes and was decorated with the Croix de Guerre and the D. S. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED